MEMORANDUM

To: Kurt Triplett, City Manager
From: Janice Coogan, Senior Planner
      Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP, Senior Planner
      Adam Weinstein, AICP, Deputy Planning Director
Date: September 20, 2018
Subject: Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plans Land Use Study Areas for Requests for Rezones and Code Amendments, File Number CAM18-00082#12

Staff Recommendation
That City Council review and comment on the proposed land use study areas associated with the draft Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plans and evaluate the Planning Commission’s recommendation on which ones should move forward to the public hearing in October. The land use study areas are proposals either initiated by property owners or city staff for a change in Comprehensive Plan land use designation, rezone or code amendment. Staff also requests direction on City study area #10, which was not developed in time to be included in the Planning Commission’s list of study areas considered at their September 13 study session. Study area #10 (see pg. 10 of the memo) would change zoning in NRH 5 and NRH 6 to encourage new, neighborhood-compatible mixed use multifamily/office and stand-alone high density housing in the North Rose Hill Business District. The overarching intent of the amendments should be to promote the vision described in the neighborhood plans, along with other city policy objectives.

Staff would like direction from the City Council on the following questions:
   a. Does the Council agree with the study areas that have been recommended not to go forward for further study? If not, which proposals should proceed?
   b. Does the Council agree with the Planning Commission’s recommendation for the requests/proposals for further study and advancement to the public hearing other than those for RH 1-A/B RHBD Regional Center(Costco site) and the Lee Johnson Auto Dealership? If not, which proposals should proceed?
   c. Does the Council feel that the staff strategies for the Costco site and the Lee Johnson Auto Dealership sufficiently address Council concerns? Or does Council wish staff to consider alternative strategies and timelines for considering those properties?
   d. Does the Council support further study on proposed changes to NRH 5 and NRH 6 (Study area #10)?
   e. Does the Council need additional information in order to make decisions?
Background
Draft Neighborhood Plans

On September 18, 2018, the City Council received a briefing on the status of the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan process and provided comments on the first draft of both Plans in order for staff to proceed with the second drafts. Several of the Council’s comments addressed the study areas and information that would be helpful in the future consideration of these proposals. Staff addresses several of these comments later in this memorandum.

Requests for land use, rezone and code amendments associated with the Neighborhood Plans

Overview

As part of the neighborhood planning process, citizen requests to potentially change the land use/zoning/Zoning Code regulations were accepted for study. Staff proposals that could further the vision of the neighborhood plans were also identified by staff. Several of the requests include expanded study areas beyond the boundaries of the initial request, in an effort to support the adopted Housing Strategy Plan and City Council directive that the neighborhood plans identify opportunity sites for additional housing, mixed use housing/commercial uses, and transit oriented development (TOD). Attachment 1 contains a vicinity map showing the location and a description of each request or study area. Attachment 4 contains the letters or emails from citizens requesting a land use/zoning/code amendment.

Each of the ten requests (eight in Rose Hill and two in Bridle Trials) are being reviewed in the context of the aspirational vision statement for both neighborhoods, looking 20 years in the future. The reviews are based on community, working group (i.e., small groups of neighborhood residents tasked with reviewing interim drafts of the plans and helping staff reconcile competing objectives), Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council input. The requests are also being reviewed for transit access, housing diversity, walkability potential, compatibility with adjacent uses, and other issues. Finally, staff recommends that unanimous property owner support for the requested change is important for the amendments to move forward, since most of the study areas are relatively small in size.

On September 13, the Planning Commission provided direction to staff on which land use/rezone/code amendment requests they support to move forward for further study to the public hearing and those that should be eliminated, with the exception of study area #10. Study area #10 has recently been added to this list of study areas as a zoning amendment proposal to implement proposed Rose Hill policies RH 50 and RH 51 in the first draft of the Rose Hill Plan. Similar to the other study areas, staff sent courtesy notifications to property owners and/or Home Owner Associations in the study area.

Analysis

The ten study areas have been evaluated by staff and a recommendation is provided below to either proceed to public hearing or for the request to be eliminated from study during the plan update process. If the proposal is recommended to proceed, staff has also identified the recommended study area. A study area is the area where the request will be studied. The analysis supporting each recommendation is shown in Attachment 2 - Neighborhood Plan Update Land Use Change Request Criteria and Evaluation Matrix. Note: the matrix does not
reflect recent public comments from property owners within or near the study areas we have received after the September 13 Planning Commission packet distribution.

**Key Issues**

1. From a high level policy perspective, staff suggests the Planning Commission and City Council weigh the benefits and the potential outcomes of these amendment requests and determine whether the City should focus on intensifying uses within existing mixed-use/commercial districts and/or on areas at the periphery of these districts (where community concern about land use compatibility issues may be greater). The key objective of either approach would be to promote a diversity of housing types, meet the new Housing Strategy Plan goals, provide employment opportunities close to transit access, and advance the land use and transportation goals of the City, and other City Council goals.

2. Proposed housing policies in both the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails draft plans address strategies other than rezones to address “missing middle” housing, or housing that is more affordable to first time home buyers, young families, and seniors wishing to age in place. These policies encourage cottage, duplex and triplex development in low density areas near the business districts and encourage Accessory Dwelling Units (ADUs) throughout both neighborhoods. Rather than expanding multifamily or mixed commercial/residential zones on the perimeter of the Neighborhood Center or East End of the Rose Hill Business District (see Figure 1 above), the City Council may wish to focus on implementing policies with new more flexible Zoning Code requirements aimed at creating more incentives to stimulate...
building affordable-by-design housing types. Staff is currently working on zoning concepts to implement these policies.

Staff recommends focusing limited city resources on those rezone and zoning amendment requests in the Bridle Trails shopping center, North Rose Hill Business District, and the Regional Center portion of the Rose Hill Business District, generally west of 124th Avenue NE, where there is greater capacity for affordable housing units and commercial floor area, and where employment opportunities can leverage utilizing the new Sound Transit Station on I-405 at the NE 85th Street Interchange (See Figure 1 above). This approach would more effectively link land use changes with existing and planned infrastructure.

**Evaluation Criteria**

In evaluating and preparing the staff recommendations for each study area, staff considered the following criteria (see Attachment 2):

- Consistency with the draft vision statements for each neighborhood
- Compatibility with adjacent uses
- Redevelopment potential in the area and the presence of new development
- Environmental constraints (landslide hazards, streams, and wetlands)
- Location within 10 minute walking distance to grocery store, jobs or other services
- Existing or planned transit with 15 minute or less headways
- Meet goals of Housing Strategy Plan
- Consistency with the Comprehensive Plan (KZC 140.25)
- Changes to sales tax revenue or jobs
- Unanimous property owner support within study area

**Planning Commission Recommendation**

The following land use study areas are organized into two groups: 1) those that the Planning Commission recommends move forward to the public hearing and 2) those that they recommend should not move forward to public hearing. A staff recommendation on each request is included. See Attachment 1 for a description of the request. See Attachment 2 for evaluation criteria and the evaluation matrix for the requests. Yes indicates that staff believes the evaluation criterion is met; no means the criterion is not met. There was only one area where staff and the Planning Commission had differing recommendations (#4 Morgan study area). The Planning Commission has not weighed in on #10 (City study area).

**Proceed to Public Hearing - On September 13, 2018 Planning Commission recommended to advance to Public Hearing the following requests:**

The numbered requests below are keyed to those in Attachment 1 and 2. See Attachment 4 for citizen or organization requests for land use change).
I. **Lake Washington Institute of Technology**  
(*see Attachment 1, page 1*)

Staff recommends advancing this proposal, because eight out of ten evaluation criteria are met. See matrix (*Attachment 2 page 1*).

a. **Allow market rate housing on campus:**
   Underutilized areas of the campus provide opportunities for work force and student housing that meet the Housing Strategy Goals, could reduce commuter vehicle trips, and benefit from good bus access. Existing vegetative buffering around the campus perimeter would screen development from off-site viewpoints.

Existing North Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan policies for LWIT limit the type of housing allowed on campus to affordable housing. Affordable housing is a defined term, which applies only to housing meeting specified income eligibility standards. While typically commanding lower rents, campus housing types such as dormitories would not necessarily meet the strict definition of affordable housing.

The proposal would allow a range of housing affordability rather than limiting it to solely affordable housing. Proposed policy RH 50 in the first draft of the Plan clarifies that in addition to defined affordable units, campus housing available to a range of incomes and that is *more affordable than standard multifamily units* is also appropriate. That change would provide LWIT more flexibility when a revised master plan is proposed.

b. **Allow limited campus expansion into the Natural Greenbelt Protection Easement**
   This request is supported by staff only if during the master plan process it is determined that the underutilized surface parking lot areas have been prioritized for redevelopment, and only minimal encroachment into the steep slope area is allowed, subject to environmental analysis. Proposed policies RH 51 and RH 52 in draft 1 of the Rose Hill Plan support this request.

---

1. The KZC defines affordable units as the following:
   1. An owner-occupied dwelling unit reserved for occupancy by eligible households and affordable to households whose household annual income does not exceed the following percent of the King County median household income, adjusted for household size, as determined by the United States Department of Housing and Urban Development (HUD), and no more than 30 percent of the monthly household income is paid for monthly housing expenses (mortgage and mortgage insurance, property taxes, property insurance and homeowners’ dues):
      a. Eighty percent [median income] in the CBD 5A, RH, TL, HENC 2, and PLA 5C zoning districts; or
      b. One hundred percent [median income] in density limited zoning districts.
   2. A renter-occupied dwelling unit reserved for occupancy by eligible households and affordable to households whose household annual income does not exceed 50 percent of the King County median household income, adjusted for household size, as determined by HUD, and no more than 30 percent of the monthly household income is paid for monthly housing expenses (rent and an appropriate utility allowance).
Planning Commission recommendation: Supports the request. The Commission requested an opinion from the City Attorney’s office and the LWIT if the type of housing to be developed can be restricted to staff, faculty and students. LWIT is considering housing primarily for the purpose of housing students, staff or faculty, but may also consider other public sector tenants through partnerships. LWIT’s response to these questions is included in Attachment 5 to this memorandum. The City Attorney’s office confirms that the City can likely limit housing to that related to students and staff of the institute.

5. RH 1-A/B RHBD Regional Center near Transit Station (see Attachment 1, page 5)

Staff recommends advancing the study of this City proposal to increase building height/density to support future redevelopment of RH 1 A and 1 B into a transit oriented development providing increased market-rate and affordable housing, and jobs near the future Sound Transit Station on I-405 and increased transit service on NE 85th St. It meets all ten of the evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2, page 6). Specifically, the proposal is consistent with the neighborhood vision, existing zoning, and Design Guidelines, the majority of land uses surrounding RH 1-A/B are commercial, there is further development potential in the study area, and there is potential for increased sales tax generation, assuming a continued presence of a big box retailer on the site. The current concept is to require that any redevelopment of the site set aside a minimum square footage of big box retail uses to ensure protection of existing high sales tax-generating uses on the site. Height comparisons are provided in Attachment 3.

Planning Commission recommendation: Agrees with staff recommendation, but requested additional coordination with Costco.

City Council comments: During the City Council briefing on September 18, the Council provided preliminary direction on what information they would like when considering this proposal in the future. Several Council members requested that they be provided an economic analysis to determine what impact the proposal would have on the City’s sales tax base. As noted above, the current concept would involve a minimum big box square footage set aside for the site that would be established in the site’s new zoning regulations. This set aside would be roughly equivalent to the existing Costco, meaning that an equivalent sized big box commercial use would be required to be included in any site redevelopment. This resembles the approach is used in the Houghton Everest Neighborhood Center HENC 1 zone. New policies would need to be added to the Rose Hill Business District section of the
Rose Hill Plan to reflect this approach. In 2019, follow-up Zoning Code amendments would be prepared.

6. Lee Johnson Auto Dealership RH 2A-2C (see Attachment 1, page 6)

Staff recommends advancing the study of the short term proposal to increase the maximum building height by 8 feet, to 75 feet (in a limited area of the site) to support future transit oriented development providing additional market-rate housing stock, affordable housing, jobs near the future Sound Transit Station on I-405 and increased transit service on NE 85th Street. Staff recommends establishing a policy for requiring a master plan through the design review process for building heights exceeding what is now allowed. With any additional height, staff supports height modulation as now required, increased affordable housing and LEED Building requirements to provide public benefits for the height increase, and increase of lot coverage and provision of open space consistent with other proposed requests in RHBD zones in the Regional Center portion of the business district that are recommended for study. The zoning amendments necessary to implement new policies would be completed in 2019. A September 13, 2018 letter from John McCullough with McCullough Hill Leary, (representing the owners of LMJ Enterprises), advocates for the longer term proposal of 160 foot height limit (see Attachment 8). Staff recommends waiting until the Sound Transit station is constructed and operational to study 160 foot height limits for this location. Various building heights are provided in Attachment 3 for comparison purposes. The short term proposal meets all ten of the evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2, page 7).

Planning Commission recommendation: Agree with staff recommendation. They would like guidance from staff on how the tiered height would work across the subject property.

City Council comments: Similar to the discussion in Study Area 5 regarding Costco, on September 18 the City Council also expressed concern over the economic impact of the requested zoning changes at the Lee Johnson site, should the site transition from a car dealership to solely Transit Oriented Development. Specifically, the loss of family wage jobs and sales tax revenue are concerns. A similar approach to that of Study Area 5 could be used to address this concern: a minimum square footage of vehicle sales and storage (including associated office space) would be required to be part of any new development of the site. This option would ensure that there would be no net loss of sales tax revenue and employment. This approach could be reflected in the policies for the Rose Hill Business District and in 2019 in the follow-up zoning amendments.
The Council also expressed concern about the potential bulk and mass impact the proposal would have on surrounding land uses, and requested a massing study in order to evaluate what impact there would be if the site were to be redeveloped. Staff has contacted the applicant to request that they provide a visual representation (e.g., conceptual bulk and massing) comparing the existing permitted maximum building envelope to the requested one. Although these may not be available at the City Council October 2 briefing, they will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration when they are submitted to staff.

7. Madison Development RH-3 (see Attachment 1, page 8)

Staff recommends advancing the study of the requested Zoning Code amendments to public hearing, specifically to increase lot coverage to 100%, and allow an increase in height (by 8 feet) to 75 foot building heights, and reduced parking contingent on parking analysis justification. The proposal meets all ten of the evaluation criteria (see Matrix Attachment 2 page 9). Height comparisons are provided in Attachment 3.

Planning Commission recommendation: Agree with staff recommendation.

City Council Comments: Similar to the site compatibility concerns regarding the Lee Johnson site in study area #6 above, the Council also expressed concern about the potential bulk and mass impact the proposal could have on surrounding land uses. They requested a massing study in order to evaluate what impact there would be if the site were to be redeveloped with the increased lot coverage and height that is requested by the applicant. Staff has contacted Madison Development to request that they provide a visual representation comparing the existing permitted maximum building envelope to the requested one. If these visual comparisons are not available for the City Council October 2 briefing, they will be forwarded to the City Council for consideration.
9. **Bridle Trails Shopping Center (see Attachment 1, page 11)**

The applicant proposed a height of 6 stories (see Attachment 4). Staff recommends that this proposal proceed to public hearing, but recommends a maximum of 5 stories (similar to recent rezoning efforts in Finn Hill neighborhood center). In order to meet the vision for the redevelopment of the shopping center to be a community gathering place with high quality shops and services, staff recommends that the current 30 foot height limit be increased, with a tiered height approach from 2 - 5 stories with upper story step backs and other requirements. The proposal meets nine out of 10 evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2, page 11). Various building heights are provided in Attachment 3 for comparison purposes. Higher density at the site would also support future Bus Rapid Transit planned to serve Bridle Trails shopping center by 2040.

**Planning Commission recommendation:** Agrees with staff recommendation to proceed to hearing for more discussion. Planning Commission and staff have received many public comments opposed to increasing the height to 5-6 stories (although a few comments strongly endorse the concept, or urge more density than recommended by staff). Planning Commission acknowledged this concern and asked staff to explore how a range of height of 30 feet to 5 stories could work so the building massing is lower on the north, east and west sides of the subject property so it would be in scale with the surrounding residential neighborhoods, neighborhood businesses and Snyder’s Corner open space.

**City Council comments:** During the City Council briefing on September 18 the Council provided preliminary direction on what information they would like when considering this proposal. Some Council members were interested in exploring options to retain legislative authority to approve a future master plan proposal for the site. Staff suggests an approach similar to that included in the Everest Neighborhood Plan for the Houghton Shopping Center. There, an additional 2 stories of height (to equal a total of 5 stories) may be authorized by a Master Plan, which is approved by the City Council after a full legislative process with opportunities for public participation. Elements that the Master Plan must contain would be noted in the Neighborhood Plan policies for Bridle Trails Shopping Center. If this approach were taken, instead of rezoning this study area as part of the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan update process (i.e., in early 2019), that step would occur at a future date through this legislative process, with heights as now allowed under current zoning remaining until that time. This approach would also allow additional public review of the specific plan for the shopping center, outside the neighborhood plan update process.
Proposal identified after September 13
Planning Commission Study Session:

10. NRH 5 and NRH 6 (see Attachment 1 page 13)

Staff recommends that study area #10 advance to a public hearing. The first draft of the Rose Hill Plan contains new Policies RH 21 and RH 22, which encourage new, neighborhood-compatible mixed use multifamily/office and stand-alone high density housing in the North Rose Hill Business District. The intent of these new polices is to incentivize the future transition of retail uses related to vehicle storage and sales and stand-alone office to either mixed use or stand-alone housing, with a modest height increase that is compatible with surrounding housing, and to make height regulations consistent across both zones. The implementation of these policies requires an amendment to the NRH 5 and NRH 6 zoning regulations to increase the allowable height to 35 feet in NRH 5 and from either 30 feet for housing or 33 feet for mixed use multifamily/office, to 35 feet in NRH 6. Since this is a voluntary incentive, it would allow existing uses to continue. The car storage and sales use would continue to be an allowed use in the RH 5 zone as would stand-alone office uses in both NRH 5 and 6 zones. The zoning amendments necessary to implement the new policies would be completed in 2019.

The study area is located in the North Rose Hill Business District (NRHBD) in North Rose Hill. Policy objectives for the NRHBD carried forward to the first draft of the Rose Hill Plan include locating more regionally focused goods and services and mixed housing with greater building heights closest to the freeway interchange at 116th Street and I-405, west of 124th Avenue NE to mirror development in the Totem Lake Business District across the street, and promoting a more local neighborhood commercial focus and lower heights and density in the remainder of the district. Within the four parcel study area east of Slater Avenue NE, three parcels are developed with stand-alone offices. The fourth parcel contains two uses: several units of the Ridgewood Village Condominium complex and car storage, which is leased to the Ford/Hyundai of Kirkland car dealership across Slater Avenue NE by the Ridgewood Village Homeowners Association. Surrounding the study area are high density condominium complexes east of Slater, and to the south a business park, containing wholesale and manufacturing uses carried over from previous industrial zoning and retail enterprises. Properties to the west lie within the Totem Lake Business District and are developed with car dealerships and other commercial uses.
The proposal meets eight of the 10 evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2, page 12). The proposal supports the NRHBD vision, promotes the 10 minutes neighborhood concept near transit and Totem Lake businesses, supports the Housing Strategy Plan by encouraging housing near the Lake Washington Institute of Technology, and would result in heights not substantially taller than surrounding multifamily uses that have existing 30 foot height limits. Emails or letters to the property owners within the study area have been sent explaining the proposal and advising of the October 25 public hearing. Mailed public notices will be sent to all property owners and residents within 300 feet of the study area prior to the public hearing. As of September 19, an email from Mary Lou Walen, Ridgewood Village Condominium Homeowners Association Board President, representing one of the parcels located in the NRH 5 study area, states neither opposition nor support of the proposal but does not object to further study (see Attachment 6).

No Planning Commission recommendation has been made on this City initiated proposal. Staff has notified the Planning Commission that this City proposal is added to the list of study areas that may advance to public hearing on October 25.

Planning Commission recommended not to advance to Public Hearing the following study areas:
The following is a summary of the land use study areas the Planning Commission recommended not proceed to public hearing. See Attachment 1 for the information about each study area and Attachment 2 for reasons supporting for the staff recommendation. The September 13, 2018 - Part 1 and Part 2 Planning Commission meeting packet also goes into more detail about the staff recommendation for each study area.

2. City initiated RH-8 study area north of NE 84th ST/132nd Ave NE (see Attachment 1, page 2)
   Planning Commission recommendation: Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation not to move forward with this proposal because of its distance from the Regional Center portion of the business district, the presence of newer housing stock within the study area, the low number of affordable housing units that would be created, neighborhood policies discouraging expansion of commercial uses into low density areas, traffic impacts on dead-end NE 84th Street, and property owner opposition within and outside the study area.
3. Jin or expanded study area north of NE 85th ST/124th Ave NE (see Attachment 1 page 3)

Planning Commission recommendation:
Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation that the study area does not meet a majority of the evaluation criteria, and that the location is outside the Regional Center with low potential for affordable housing, there is property opposition within the area and commercial zoning could have adverse impacts on adjacent residential property.

4. Morgan request for three properties (8241, 8249, 8251 122nd Ave NE) and Velozo property at 8245 122nd Ave NE outlined in red or expanded study area outlined in blue between 122nd Ave NE and 124th Ave NE and north of Kirkland Cemetery south of NE 85th Street request for rezone to commercial or higher density residential (see Attachment 1, page 4)

Staff recommended that a revised expanded study area advance to public hearing (see Attachment 2 and map on right). Sharon Velozo did not give consent to include her property in Morgan’s request and opposes the zoning change. In addition, three of the five property owners in the revised staff recommended study area below do not support the request (8230, 8232, 8234 122nd Ave NE).
Planning Commission recommendation: The Planning Commission disagreed with staff to proceed to hearing. The Commission believed it is very similar to the Jin request and does not support continuing to public hearing. Rezoning a small number of parcels would not significantly increase the amount of affordable housing benefits. In addition, the rezones are far from achieving unanimous property owner support.

8. Daniel Weise request to rezone three parcels in Bridle Trails south of NE 64th ST from RSX 35 to RSX 7.2 (see Attachment 1, page 10)

Planning Commission recommendation: Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation not to proceed with this request in order to preserve RSX 35 sized lots capable of keeping horses, consistent with zoning to the south and east that supports the policies in the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan. The proposal does not meet eight of the ten evaluation criteria (see Attachment 2, page 10) and would be inconsistent with the vision for the Bridle Trails neighborhood.
Eden Ekubit request at 12822 NE 85th Street in the RH8 zone to allow increased height, reduced setbacks and reduced parking (received after July 26 Planning Commission Study Session).

Planning Commission recommendation: Planning Commission agreed with the staff recommendation not to advance this proposal to a hearing. The RH-8 zone already allows an increase in height from 30 to 35 feet, if a minimum lot area of 18,000 square feet is achieved. There is no compelling reason to study this proposal further, given the limited benefit to the community that would result from this request.

Public Outreach for Land Use, Rezone, Code Amendment Requests

On September 4, prior to the September 13 Planning Commission study session, staff sent a courtesy notice to all Kirkland residents/tenants and all property owners for properties both in and outside Kirkland’s jurisdiction, that are within each study area as well as within 300 feet of each property or study area informing them of the meeting, its purpose, participation opportunities and project schedule. Also, staff sent a letter to each study area property owner informing them that their property is located in an area the City is studying for a change in land use, zoning or code amendment related to the neighborhood plan update project, and in addition to the notice described above, provided existing and proposed land use/zoning information, and the applicant justification for request. Email announcements were distributed informing of the upcoming meeting schedule.

Public Comments

Public comments received by noon on September 18, 2018 are enclosed (Attachment 7). Comments received after distribution of this meeting packet will be forwarded to the City Council either prior to or at the meeting.

Next Steps

Integration of requests into Second Draft of Neighborhood Plans

Once the City Council provides direction on which requests should proceed for further study, staff will incorporate revised polices (if any) into the second draft Plans. Along with the second draft of each Plan, staff is seeking to provide visual studies to evaluate proposed building height or other code amendment changes. State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) analysis for those proposals will also be completed. The land use and zoning maps will also be revised to reflect the proposed rezones. Per Zoning Code requirements, public notice signs will be installed on or near the properties proposed for rezones. Public notices will be mailed to property owners and residents within 300 feet of each study area prior to the public hearing.
The Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council will consider all proposed changes to the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plans and public comment at the public hearings in October and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council makes the final decision to approve, deny or conditionally approve amendment requests.

Although associated zoning amendments to implement these requests would typically also be considered at the public hearings, because of the ambitious schedule for Neighborhood Plan adoption (December 2018), staff anticipates that necessary implementing regulations will follow in early 2019.

Upcoming Meeting Schedule:
- October 22, 2018 - Public hearing with Houghton Community Council on Bridle Trails Plan
- October 25, 2018 - Public hearing with Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council: Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Plans and rezone study areas
- November date TBD - Planning Commission deliberation on recommendation as needed
- November 20, 2018 - City Council briefing
- December 11, 2018 - City Council adoption
- January 28, 2019 - Houghton Community Council final action on Bridle Trails Plan

Attachments:
1. Land Use Zoning Change Study Areas Map and Descriptions
2. Land Use Change Request Criteria and Evaluation Matrix
3. Building Heights Comparison
4. Citizen emails/letters requesting land use changes
5. LWIT email dated 9-18-2018
6. Mary Lou Walen NRH 5 email dated 9-19-2018
7. Public comments received as of September 18, 2018
8. John McCullough with McCullough Hill Leary letter dated 9-13-2018
Land Use Zoning Change Study Areas

See attached for more information
Property owner and City requests for land use/zoning change by Neighborhood- Revised 9/18/2018

Notes:
1. Sites with additional development potential are outlined in blue; vacant parcels are outlined in pink.
2. Sites with additional development potential are defined as non-residential parcels with land value greater to or equal to 50% of improvement value, or residential parcels with sufficient land area to accommodate additional units based on the underlying zoning.

North Rose Hill Neighborhood

1. Applicant: Lake Washington Institute of Technology

Requests:
1. Expand existing or future master plan improvements into existing Natural Greenbelt Protection Easement along western slope.
2. Allow market rate housing in addition to affordable housing. (see April 23 email)

Issues:
- Should this slope area be designated a wildlife corridor or visual amenity in addition to critical area?
- Should future development be prohibited in existing NGPE?

Existing NRH Plan Policies:
- Only pedestrian/bike connections allowed in NGPE area.
- Only affordable housing allowed.

Existing Land Use/Zoning: Institutions/Planned Area 14

Environmental Constraints:
Stream and High Landslide Susceptibility area

Options:
A. Retain existing policies.
B. Revise housing policy to encourage both market rate and affordable housing.
C. Designate NGPE area to preserve the tree canopy for wildlife corridor and woodland in addition to geologic hazard areas with revised master plan.
D. Allow the master plan process to determine a minimum allowable encroachment into the NGPE after first utilizing the redevelopment potential in the existing surface parking lot; subject to environmental review analysis.

Preliminary Staff Recommendation:
B, C and D.
### NE 85th ST Subarea

#### Applicant: City

Requests: Increase density and/or commercial capacity on existing larger underdeveloped sites within Rose Hill Business District commercial corridor or expand boundaries of District.

**Justification:** Increase housing opportunity sites and opportunities for smaller-scale commercial uses to implement the 10 minute neighborhood and adopted Housing Strategy Plan.

**Issue:** Determine if there is interest in changing land use designations to expand commercial uses or rezone to higher density within existing business district boundary or expanding district at perimeter.

**Study Area:**
South perimeter of East End (128th to 132nd) - behind RH8, east of RM 3.6 zone, and north of NE 84th St.

**Zoning Options:**
- A. No Change - Retain Low Density RS 7.2
- B. Rezone to Mixed Use Limited Commercial/Multifamily
- C. Rezone to Mixed Use Office/Multifamily
- D. Rezone to Multifamily

**Preliminary Staff Recommendation:** None at this time (additional study needed).

### Further Developable/Vacant:

*Study Area*
NE 85th ST Subarea

3. Applicant: Jin

Request: Rezone property owned by applicant to mixed use commercial/multifamily or higher density residential. Expand to 4 lots within the RS 7.2 zone.

Justification - increase density to provide more affordable housing and expand retail uses near NE 85th St commercial corridor, Sound Transit BRT station on lots with homes built in the 1960’s (see June 4 email).

Location - 8527 126th Avenue NE (PIN 123310-0879)
Existing Zoning/Land use: RS 7.2 min. lot size/Low Density Residential 6 du/acre

Study Area Options:
A. Jin’s request of 4 properties in RS 7.2 zone, including his lot:
   - 8519 - 10,400 s.f.
   - 8523 - 19,200 s.f.
   - 8525 - 15,600 s.f.
   - 8527 - 14,000 s.f.
B. Expand study area to include all 11 properties in RS 7.2, including those in Option A:
   - 8535 - 6,482 s.f.
   - 12503 - 10,400 s.f.
   - 12507 - 20,016 s.f.
   - 12500 - 17,500 s.f.
   - 12506 - 16,930 s.f.
   - 12514 - 15,281 s.f.
   - 8707 - 16,033 s.f.

Zoning Options:
A. No Change - retain Low Density RS 7.2
B. Rezone to Commercial
C. Rezone to Mixed Use Limited Commercial/Multifamily
D. Rezone to Multifamily
   - High
   - Medium

Preliminary Staff Recommendation: None at this time (additional study needed).
**NE 85th ST Subarea**

**4. Applicant: Martin and Sharon Morgan**

Morgan’s Request: Rezone four parcels to commercial zone or higher residential density. Sharon and Martin Morgan own 3 out of the four parcels (8241, 8249, 8251 122nd Ave NE). Sharon Velozo owns the property at 8245 122nd Ave NE.

Applicant Justification - increase density and intensity of uses near Sound Transit station; maintain single family uses in other areas of neighborhood (see May 1 email).

**Location/Existing Zoning/Land Use:**

Two of Morgan parcels are zoned RM 3.6 at 8249 122nd Ave NE (PIN 123310-0275) and 8251 122nd Ave NE (PIN 123310-0276) Medium Density

One parcel of Morgan’s and Sharon Velozo’s property are zoned Low Density- single family RS 7.2 at 8241 122nd Ave NE (PIN 123310-0270) and 8245 122nd Ave NE (PIN 123310-0271) respectively.

**Parcel sizes:**

- 8251-10,506 s.f.
- 8249 - 20,735 s.f.
- 8245 - 19,085 s.f.
- 8241 - 12,150 s.f.

**Study Area Options:**

A. 4 lots owned by Morgans/Velozo

B. Expand study area to RS 7.2 zoned properties between 120th Ave NE and 124th Ave NE, north of the cemetery (see City proposal above).

**Land Use/Zoning Options:**

A. No Change - retain medium and low density RM 3.6 and RS 7.2

B. Rezone to Commercial

C. Rezone to Mixed Use Commercial/Multifamily

D. Rezone to Multifamily
   - High
   - Medium
Preliminary Staff Recommendation:
None at this time, but not in support of rezoning to commercial.
5. Applicant: City

Request: Consider increased density and intensity of land uses within the existing RHBD Regional Center zones closest to the future Sound Transit Station at NE 85th/I-405 interchange and Bus Rapid Transit along NE 85th ST.

Issue: Are land use changes needed in RHBD Regional Center to take advantage of proximity to BRT Station and future BRT along NE 85th for Transit Oriented Development?

Existing RH 1A, 1B, 2A, 2B, 2C, RH3 zoning already allows a mix of commercial and residential uses and building height of 5-6 stories. Issues to study include: is additional height needed, increases in lot coverage, mix of uses to encourage retention of office space and jobs, and other code changes to accommodate the urban density envisioned by the original Rose Hill Business District plan, zoning, and to support future transit investments.

Existing Land Use: Commercial

Land Use/Zoning Options:
A. No Change - retain current zoning standards.
B. Revisit zoning regulations to increase height in locations now allowing a maximum 67' height limit, increase lot coverage in locations now allowing 80% to 90% or 100%, evaluate mix of uses and ground floor use restrictions.

Preliminary Staff Recommendation: None at this time (additional study needed).
**NE 85th ST Subarea**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Zoning</th>
<th>Further Developable/Vacant</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

6. **Applicant: LMJ Enterprises, LP (Lee Johnson car dealership site)**

**Contact:** John McCullough with McCullough Hill Leary, PS

**Requests:** Consider increased density and height within existing RH2A, B and C zones for both short and long term development.
1. **Short term:** zoning changes allowing height increase to 75’ across entire site, for residential over ground floor commercial.
2. **Future Master Plan for consolidated site development of more than 5 acres phased over 10 +/- years with 160’ height (15 stories) for residential and commercial.

**Applicant Justification:** Increase height and density because of location near BRT station/regional trans. corridor and capacity of site to make sizeable contributions to housing and commercial capacity (see July 6 email).

**Issue:** Should additional height or density be approved, both in short and long term, in recognition of TOD opportunity adjacent to planned Sound Transit BRT station and future BRT along NE 85th?

Existing RH 2A, 2B, 2C, zoning allows a mix of commercial and residential uses with building heights of 4-6 stories (maximum 67’) generally transitioning with topography of site. No density limit, except in RH 2C, (12 du/acre).

**Existing Land Use:** Commercial

**Land Use/Zoning Options:**

**Short term:**
- A. No change - retain current height and density standards.
- B. Increase height limit for mixed use residential/commercial uses across entire site to 75’.
- C. Increase height in locations now allowing a maximum 67’ height limit.
- D. Increase density in locations now allowing maximum of 12 du/acre to unlimited density.

**Long Term:**
- A. Wait until next cycle of Neighborhood Plan update to consider proposal.
B. During this update, establish policy for Master Plan process now for RH 2A, B, C. for some minimum number of acres.
C. During this update, draft policy to establish in the future height limits/density and mix of uses/connections/open space/design guidelines.

Preliminary Staff Recommendation:
- None at this time for changes to height or density for either short or long term proposals (additional study needed).

Short term proposal:
- If a change to height and density is allowed, refine as necessary, design guidelines for all new, expanded or remodeled commercial, multifamily or mixed use buildings.

Long term:
- Establish policies to develop a master plan for future long term development of TOD at this site for a minimum acreage that involves Rose Hill residents.
- Establish policies to refine as necessary, design guidelines for all new, expanded or remodeled commercial, multifamily or mixed use buildings.
7. Madison Development request for RH 3 code amendments

Contact: Jim Gallaugher, Principal with Madison Development

Requests: Madison Development requests code amendments to RH 3 zone (Petco site at NE 85th ST and 120-122nd Ave NE) to change:
- maximum lot coverage from 80% to 100% (while providing open space plazas and gardens into the design),
- increase building height by eight feet (from 67' to 75') to allow for decorative parapets, residential roof amenity spaces, open railings, landscape planters,
- reduce the required parking ratio for residential and retail uses.

The proposed mixed use residential (market and affordable housing)/commercial project is currently going through the Design Review Process with the Design Review Board and requesting these minor code changes will allow them to achieve the desired vision and development goals for the site.

The reduced parking ratio request may be able to be achieved administratively through the allowed parking modification or shared parking provisions in the Zoning Code without a code amendment (See July 13, 2018 letter). Applicant is preparing a parking study.

Applicant justification: The lot coverage and height requests would allow the project to meet the intent and vision for the RH-3 zoning and Design Guidelines to achieve an urban mixed use residential/commercial, transit oriented project near the new Sound Transit Station at the NE 85th ST/I-405 Interchange.

Five Parcels: 123850-0110, 0115, 0125, 0135, 0140

Issue: The 80% lot coverage may have been an oversight when transferring the old BCX suburban commercial zoning requirements to the more urban mixed use RH 3 zoning in 2006. The unusual existing grade changes of the site sloping from the higher point at NE 85th ST to the lower parking lot below, make it challenging
for the applicant to meet the way the code requires maximum building height to be calculated.

Existing RH 3 zone allows a mix of commercial and residential uses with building heights of 67’ above average building elevation along the north side of the zone with a maximum of 45’ above NE 85th ST.

Maximum lot coverage is 80%.

Parking code requirements depend on the type of commercial use (retail, office, or restaurant). For residential uses parking requirements are based on number of bedrooms. For a studio (1.2 per unit) or 1.3 for 1 bedroom to 1.8 per 3 or more bedrooms plus visitor parking.

Existing Land Use: One story mixed commercial

Land Use/Zoning Options:
A. No change retain current height, lot coverage and parking standards.
B. Increase building height limit for mixed use residential/commercial uses to 75’ and lot coverage to 100%.

Preliminary Staff Recommendation:
Support approving code amendments to increase maximum lot coverage to 100%; building height to 75’ above average building elevation consistent with other higher density commercial areas. Staff supports the concept of shared or reduced parking arrangement between the commercial and residential uses given the location near the future transit facilities provided the mix of tenants and results of a parking analysis.
8. Applicant: Daniel Weise

Request: Change land use from LDR 1 to LDR 5 for 3 properties around Silver Spurs Ranch at 6422 128th Ave NE (PIN 1241500340), 6425 128th Ave NE (PIN 1241500345), 6424 126th Ave NE (PIN 1241500351) (see March 26, 2018 email).

Applicant justification - increase density because these lots gain access from NE 65th ST, and therefore have more in common with RS 7.2 zone rather than with the rest of Silver Spurs, which receives access from NE 60th ST.

Issue: Would this request compromise the equestrian vision for this neighborhood?

Existing Land Use: Low Density single family
Existing Zoning: RSX 35

Parcel Sizes:
6422 - 45,738 s.f.
6424 - 35,741 s.f.
6425 - 35,711 s.f.

Study Area:
3 lots including the Weise property, all outside the Silver Spurs Ranch Development.

Land Use/Zoning Options:
A. No Change - Retain LDR 1 RSX 35 zoning
B. Rezone to LDR 5 RSX 7.2

Preliminary Staff Recommendation: No change in order to preserve equestrian uses.
**Bridle Trails Neighborhood**

**9. Applicant: Bridle Trails Shopping Center**

Contacts: Don Wells with Tech City Bowl, and Richard Schoebel with ROIC, Tom Parsons and Glen Scheiber with The Holland Group

Requests:
- Increase building height to 65 feet and higher to increase mixed use density for both Tech City Bowl and Bridle Trails shopping center properties, and allow for rooftop open space amenities (see June 28 2018 letter).
- Allow residential flexibility on ground floor. Affordable housing at max 20% of residential units.
- Flexibility in parking standards. See written proposal.

Existing Neighborhood Plan policies support developing a plan for future development of the commercial center that involves both South Rose Hill and Bridle Trails residents.

Establish new design guidelines for the commercial center for all new, expanded or remodeled commercial, multifamily or mixed use buildings.

Study Issues:
- How extensive should the master plan be?
- Minimum lot size consolidation?
- Are the existing performance standards in plan adequate or need revising?
- Increase building height to what?
- Add affordable housing requirement
- Currently no design review is required in BCX- Should this be changed?

Land Use/Zoning Options:
A. Keep existing BCX zoning
B. Establish BT Neighborhood Center Zoning including an increase in building height

Preliminary Staff Recommendation: Some range of height/density increase, and associated zoning code amendments.
### 10. Applicant: City

Request: Consider modest increased height within the existing NRHBD North Rose Hill Business District Zones NRH-5 (5 feet increase) and NRH-6 (2-5 feet increase) to incentivize the future redevelopment of car storage areas and single-use office areas into mixed-use neighborhood or stand-alone housing, compatible with surrounding housing.

Issue: Is height incentive desired to encourage transition to more compatible mixed use office/multifamily or housing in area close to the Lake WA Institute of Technology within the Totem Lake Urban Center?

Existing NRH zoning allows maximum building height 30' above average building elevation in both NRH 5 and NRH 6, except in NRH 6, where 33' is allowed if redeveloped as mixed use office/multifamily (to allow for 13 foot office floor plate). Issues to study include: is additional height desired to encourage transition of existing stand-alone offices and car storage, to accommodate the land uses envisioned by the updated Rose Hill Plan and to support Housing Strategy Plan. While a building height of 60' or greater would be more likely to support redevelopment in this area, the modest height increase proposed here would make the development of 3-story mixed-use buildings more feasible, and be sensitive to neighbor concerns about building height.

Existing Land Use/Zoning:
- Commercial NRH 5
- Office NRH 6

Land Use/Zoning Options:
A. No Change - retain current zoning standards.
B. Revise zoning regulations to increase height by 5 feet in NRH 5 zone and 2-5 feet in NRH 6 zone for housing or mixed use office multifamily uses.

Preliminary Staff Recommendation: Option B.
The following matrix evaluates each land use study area and how the proposed rezone or code amendment proposal meets (Yes) or does not meet (No).

**Evaluation Criteria**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Land Use Study Area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
| 1. Lake Washington Institute Technology (LWIT) (North Rose Hill) Request: Add residential units for students and staff on campus master plan | YES - Underutilized areas of the Campus provide opportunities for work force and student housing on campus.  

- Adding residential uses would transform campus from a commuter school to all hours living environment. | YES - Heavy vegetative buffer blocks view from adjacent homes, minimizing visual impacts. | YES - Campus has underutilized portions of site. Subject to existing or revised master plan (current master plan expires in 2020). | YES - If development is focused on the existing area occupied by surface parking lots | NO - However, the establishment of a pedestrian connection to the Totem Lake District would promote this criterion. | YES - Existing bus route 238 provides service on 132nd Ave NE.  

- By 2025 more frequent service connection to transit centers: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothell | YES - The proposal would promote Comprehensive Plan goals related to affordable housing, connectivity and economic development. | YES - Allows live/work options; reduces commute hour school impacts.  

- May increase sales tax within Kirkland | N/A |
### Evaluation Matrix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. RH-8 (City) (South Rose Hill)</td>
<td>NO - East end of RHBD, low density single family abuts existing commercial uses. Neighborhood Plan policies discourage expansion of commercial into low density residential areas.</td>
<td>NO - Impacts of commercial expansion on residential uses. NE 84th ST is not a through street, posing traffic constraints. This proposal could substantially increase traffic on local streets that are ill-equipped to handle congestion.</td>
<td>NO - Majority of study area comprises newer detached homes (2014). Three parcels to the west of religious facility built in (1960 &amp; 1969).</td>
<td>YES - No mapped streams/wetlands</td>
<td>YES - Shops and services are within walking distance for residents</td>
<td>YES - Existing bus service on NE 85th ST, 124th Ave, NE 80th ST provides transit services within walking distance. By 2025 there will be more frequent transit service connection to transit centers: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothell</td>
<td>NO - If rezoned to multifamily or office/multi family, there would be a low number of affordable housing produced. The potential impacts of rezoning on the single family residential outway the amount of affordable housing produced.</td>
<td>NO - Commercial expansion on NE 84th ST would be incompatible with land use policies related to transition areas between higher density uses and low density single family</td>
<td>NO - Would allow for very minor business expansion</td>
<td>NO - As of 8/15, 5 emails from property owners within or nearby oppose rezone: - Isenburg (owns two homes in study area on NE 84th ST; no addresses given). - Olivia Ahna (8402 132nd Ave NE in Redmond), - Lingjun Fu (13108 NE 84th ST). - Levin (no address given). - Carter Bagg</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Study Options:**
- **A.** No Change - Retain Low Density RSX 7.2 (Under existing zoning potential for 19 lots)
- **B.** Rezone to Office RH 8 (potential for 90,184 sf gfa limited commercial/office)
- **C.** Rezone to Mixed Use Office/Multifamily PR 3.6 (if all lots combined potential for 62,435 sf gfa office and 3 units (less than 4 units; no affordable units))
- **D.** Rezone to Multifamily:
  - RM 3.6 (potential for 47 units (3.8 affordable units) (28 additional units compared to A) or
  - RM 1.8 (potential for 77 units (7.7 affordable housing units) (73 additional units compared to A)

**Staff recommendation:**
Do not support rezone to RH 8 for the following reasons:
- Commercial uses could be incompatible with single-family uses.
- A majority of study area comprises newer single family homes unlikely to redevelop. (7 homes built in 2014; 3 homes built 1960-1970).
- Impacts to existing residential development outweigh rezoning from RSX 7.2 to RH-8, PR or RM.
- 5 property owners within study area oppose rezone.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Study Area</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>NO and YES</td>
<td>NO and YES</td>
<td>NO and YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Jin or expanded study area (City) (North Rose Hill)</td>
<td>YES Located within walking distance of future transit station and services.</td>
<td>NO -Surrounding uses to the east and north are low density. -Staff have received complaints in the past of commercial employees parking on residential side street (126th Ave NE). -Moderate impact if rezoned to multifamily</td>
<td>YES Jin’s study area four lots were built in the 1960’s. -Expanded study area properties to the north were built in 1983.</td>
<td>YES Smaller lots in this location are close to shops and services promoted by the 10 minute neighborhood concept</td>
<td>YES -4 blocks away from future NE 85th ST/I-405 transit station -Bus Rapid Ride on NE 85th ST by 2025.</td>
<td>NO If rezoned to multi-family 5-8 potential affordable housing units is minimal.</td>
<td>NO Potential impacts of rezone options on adjacent properties outweigh benefits.</td>
<td>YES If rezoned to commercial could allow expansion of adjacent commercial properties and increase small amount of jobs.</td>
<td>NO and YES One property owner within the study area opposes and did not give consent: -Elwell (8525 126th Ave NE). -One property owner outside study area: -Susan Davis (no address)</td>
<td>Two emails of support: -one owner is within the study area: -Lysen (8523 126th Ave NE) -one outside study area: -Lamoureux (8720 126th Ave NE)</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

3. Jin or expanded study area (City) (North Rose Hill)

Request: Rezone parcels from RS 7.2 to RM or commercial zoning.

Study Areas:
- Jin’s request (1 parcel built 1960 and 3 in 1968)
- City expanded study to north 7 additional parcels in RS 7.2 to include 11 total parcels. 5 parcels built in 1983; 1 parcel in 1949)

Study Options:
A. No Change - retain Low Density RS 7.2
   Jin’s 4 parcels, potential for 8 lots
   Total both study areas if redeveloped: 22 lots (net 11 additional lots)
B. Rezone to Commercial RH 5A or RH 5B:
   Jin’s 4 parcels: 17,760 sf commercial and 11,840 sf office
   Expanded study area: 30,792 sf commercial and 20,528 sf gfa office
C. Rezone to Office RH 8:
   Jin’s 4 parcels: 38,480 sf gfa office
   Expanded area: 66,717 sf gfa office
D. Rezone to Multifamily
   High density RM 1.8: Jin’s area: 33 units or
   Expanded area: 57 units
   Total 106 units (includes 16 bonus) (7.9 affordable units).
   A net increase of 84 housing units compared to A above.
   Medium density RM 3.6: Jin’s area: 19 units or
   Expanded area: 31 units.
   Total 54 units (includes 8 bonus units) (4.5 affordable units).
   A net increase in 32 housing units compared to A above.

Staff recommendation:
Keep existing zoning. Do not support rezone of Jin parcels or expanded study area. Although close to shops, services and future transit station, older housing stock (1960-1980’s) and shown as further development potential under existing zoning, there is property owner opposition and low potential for substantially increasing the supply of housing. If rezoned to commercial there would be high impact on adjacent properties.
The following matrix evaluates each land use study area and how the proposed rezone or code amendment proposal meets (Yes) or does not meet (No).

### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>4. Morgan or expanded study area (City) (South Rose Hill)</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request: Rezone parcels from RS 7.2 to RM or commercial zoning.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study areas:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• 4 lots owned by Morgan family (1 parcel built in 1949, 1 parcel built in 1935, 2 built in 1960's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Expanded study area to RS 7.2 zoned properties between 120th Ave NE and 124th Ave NE, north of the cemetery (see City proposed expanded study area above). (15 parcels built in prior to 1960's; 3 parcels built in 1970's; 12 built newer than 1970's)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No Change - retain parcels that are medium and low density RM 3.6 and RS 7.2 Morgan: Potential for 13 lots/units</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded study area: 55 lots (net 21 lots from existing)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Rezone to Office RH 8 Morgan: 40,609 sf gfa office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded study area: 255,234 sf gfa limited retail/office</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Rezone to Mixed Use Commercial/Multifamily PR 3.6 Morgan: 28,114 sf gfa office; 1.12 units (no affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded study area: 176,700 sf gfa office; 7 units (.7 affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D. Rezone to Multifamily High density RM 1.8: Morgan: 35 units plus 7 bonus = 42 units (3.5 affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded study area: 218 units plus 42 bonus= 260 units (21 affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Medium density RM 3.6: Morgan: 17 plus 3 bonus=20 units (1.7 affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Expanded study area: 109 units plus 22 bonus= 131 units (10.9 affordable units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Staff recommendation:</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Do not support Option B rezoning to commercial for either Morgan’s lots or expanded study area. Support rezoning Morgan’s parcels to RM 3.6 and a smaller expanded area described below:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>• Morgan parcels: Maintain 2 Morgan parcels that are RM 3.6 (8251, 8249 122nd Ave NE). Rezone two Morgan parcels to the south that are RS 7.2 to RM 3.6. (Three out of the four parcels are further developable).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Support rezoning 3 parcels across the street to east (8230, 8232, 8234 122nd Ave NE; built in 1967; further developable potential based on land to improvement value) from RS 7.2 to RM 3.6

Support rezoning 2 parcels at 8239 and 8231 124th Ave NE from RS 7.2 to RM 3.6 (Kaiser/Mock support change; built in 1960; show further developable due to size of parcel; RM 3.6 zoning to the north)

Medium density zoning along edge of business district is consistent with other areas as a transition use between commercial and low density single family zoning. Supports added affordable housing within walking distance of transit and services.
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5. RH 1-A/B RHBD Regional Center near Transit Station (City initiated study) (North Rose Hill)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study area RH 1-A-B zone (Includes Costco, vehicle gas stations, office building located north of NE 85th ST/I-405 Interchange) increased density and building height to support future Sound Transit Station. See analysis for Lee Johnson and RH 3 in Regional Center below</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Options:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>A. No Change - retain current zoning standards: allows mixed use residential, large retail, office. Maximum building height is 67’ above average building elevation. Existing RH 1A/1B potential: Total commercial or office: 1,068,972 sf gfa Residential: 852 units (85.2 affordable housing units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Increase building height to 75’ above average building elevation same as Study Area 6 below.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff recommendation:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Support increase in building height/density to support future redevelopment into a transit oriented development providing increased housing, affordable housing, jobs near future Sound Transit Station on I-405 and increased transit service on NE 85th ST.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>6. Lee Johnson Auto Dealership RH 2A-2C</strong> (South Rose Hill)</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>YES</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request: Increase height to 75' or 160' (15 stories), unlimited density</td>
<td>Vision statement envisions a walkable, transit-oriented pedestrian village around the NE 85th ST/I-405 transit hub.</td>
<td>Under existing or proposed zoning there is an opportunity to provide Transit Oriented Development with additional housing or jobs near the NE 85th ST/I-405 Sound Transit Station.</td>
<td>Existing surface parking lot for auto dealership could be considered underutilized given location near future transit station and I-405 interchange.</td>
<td>No mapped stream or wetland</td>
<td>Within walking distance of future Sound Transit Station at NE 85th/I-405.</td>
<td>Potential for increase in affordable housing units near transit station.</td>
<td>The proposal would promote Comprehensive Plan goals related to affordable housing, connectivity and economic development</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Study Options:</strong> A. No change - retain current height and density standards.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Current maximum building height:</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2A = 67' ABE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2B = 55' ABE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RH 2C = 35' ABE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Max Density in RH 2C is RM 3.6 elsewhere none. Max lot coverage is 80%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Existing RH2A, 2B, 2C estimated potential: Total commercial or office: 485,048 sf gross floor area (gfa) Potential residential: 387 units plus bonus units of 77 = 464 total units (38.7 affordable housing units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. Increase height limit for mixed use residential/commercial uses across entire site to 75' (one story increase): Total estimated potential commercial or office: 1,068,972 sf gfa. Residential units: 474 units (40 affordable housing units)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C. Increase height in locations now allowing a maximum 67' height limit. Increase density in locations now allowing maximum of 12 du/acre to unlimited density.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Long Term:</strong> A. Wait until next cycle of Neighborhood Plan update to consider proposal.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B. During this update, establish policy for Master Plan process now for RH 2A, B, C. for some minimum number of acres. Draft policy to establish in the future height limits/density and mix of uses/connections/open space/design guidelines. 150' (5 -8 additional office or residential stories). Potential office at 5 additional stories=2,137,944 sf gfa office Residential potential: (8 units per floor x 8 floors=916 units plus 183 bonus units or total of 1,099 units increase lot coverage from 80% to 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Staff recommendation:** A. Do not support 160' in building height. Wait until next cycle of Plan update and ST station is constructed. Support the following changes requiring a master plan through design review process: B. In RH 2A increase maximum building height from existing 67' ABE to 75' ABE
The following matrix evaluates each land use study area and how the proposed rezone or code amendment proposal meets (Yes) or does not meet (No).

<p>| | | | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>- In RH 2B, 2C keep height same.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- No limit on residential density in any of the zones.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Require 20% affordable housing units similar to YBD 1 requirements.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Require LEED building requirements</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Change lot coverage to 100%</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>- Some minimum amount of public open space</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Evaluation of Madison Development in RH-3 (North Rose Hill)

**Request:** Increase height by 8’, increase lot coverage from 80% - 100%, reduce required parking ratio. The additional height is needed because of the way the maximum building height calculations are measured and dramatic changes in topography between the public right of way and property line and across the site.

Current development proposal under existing zoning:
- 200,000 gross floor area (gfa) retail use
- 740 residential units (within four buildings with 5-6 levels) (74 affordable housing units).

**Study Options:**
- A. No change retain current 67’ height, 80% lot coverage and parking standards.
- B. Increase building height limit for mixed use residential/commercial uses to 75’ and lot coverage to 100%.

**Staff Recommendation:** Support code amendments to:
- increase maximum lot coverage to 100%.
- increase building height to 75’ above average building elevation consistent with other higher density commercial areas. 8 feet additional height will be negligible.
- the concept of shared or reduced parking arrangement between the commercial and residential uses given the location near the future transit facilities provided the mix of tenants and results of a parking analysis. Zoning code amendments to be completed in 2019.

#### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>7. Madison Development in RH-3 (North Rose Hill)</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>YES</td>
<td>No comments received</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request: Increase height by 8’, increase lot coverage from 80% - 100%, reduce required parking ratio. The additional height is needed because of the way the maximum building height calculations are measured and dramatic changes in topography between the public right of way and property line and across the site.</td>
<td>Under existing or proposed zoning there is an opportunity to provide Transit Oriented Development with additional housing or jobs near the NE 85th ST/I-405 Sound Transit Station. Proposed development is consistent with the vision in the Design Guidelines for the Rose Hill Business District.</td>
<td>-8 feet of additional height would have a negligible effect. -Development proposal will provide public open spaces and landscaping throughout site. -A mix of uses could support a reduced rate of parking if supported by a parking study. -Surrounding uses are commercial.</td>
<td>A piped underground stream crosses the site (not required to daylight stream).</td>
<td>Proposed development will provide housing, shops and services within walking distance of neighborhoods and transit.</td>
<td>Within walking distance of Sound Transit Station at NE 85th ST/I-405.</td>
<td>Increase in estimated 740 residential units and 74 affordable housing units.</td>
<td>The proposed development is consistent with the vision for the Rose Hill Business District and compact mixed land uses</td>
<td>Both jobs and sales tax revenue</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following matrix evaluates each land use study area and how the proposed rezone or code amendment proposal meets **(Yes)** or does not meet **(No)**.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Land Use Study Area</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. Daniel Weise (Bridle Trails)</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>One of the property owners of the 3 lots is opposed to rezone (did not give consent): Hay 6424 126th Ave NE. Two emails received from people outside the study area oppose rezone: -Plut (17 Bridlewood Circle) -Michelle Claassen (no address given on 128th Ave NE)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Request: Move zoning district line to rezone three parcels from RSX 35 to RSX 7.2</td>
<td>Study Options:</td>
<td>A. No Change - Retain LDR 1 RSX 35 zoning - No additional lots permitted under current zoning. RSX 35 requires a 10,000 sf area for a paddock.</td>
<td>B. Rezone to LDR 5 RSX 7.2 - 11 rezoned, potential for total of 16 lots.</td>
<td>Staff recommendation: No change in zoning order to preserve RSX 35 sized lots capable of keeping horses consistent with zoning to the south and east.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Reduces equestrian lots if rezoned to smaller lots. - Maintaining the equestrian community character of the neighborhood is very important to the residents.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>Rezone would change the character of the area by allowing smaller lots without paddock areas. - Rezoning those 3 lots would reduce the number of lots capable of keeping horses and change the equestrian character of the area.</td>
<td>NO</td>
<td>No mapped streams or wetlands on parcels.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The following matrix evaluates each land use study area and how the proposed rezone or code amendment proposal meets (Yes) or does not meet (No).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>9. Bridle Trails Shopping Center (Bridle Trails)</td>
<td>YES Future redevelopment of the shopping center is a shared vision in the draft vision statement as a community gathering place for local quality shops and services.</td>
<td>YES If buildings step up from lower height areas around perimeter of property to be more compatible with 2-3 story residential and commercial uses surrounding the property and across the street.</td>
<td>YES Existing uses: One story Shopping Center (built in 1980) and one story Tech City Bowl bowling alley (built in 1957)</td>
<td>YES No mapped wetlands or streams.</td>
<td>YES Redevelopment of the site into a mixed use residential/commmerci al neighborhood focus project promotes the 10 minute neighborhood concept for surrounding residents.</td>
<td>YES New zoning for future redevelopment would be consistent with the land use, housing, and transportation policies to encourage mixed use development.</td>
<td>YES Redevelopment would allow for increase in jobs and could support higher-quality retail establishments in shopping center.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Study Options:</td>
<td>A. Keep existing BCX zoning with building height 30' above existing average building elevation (ABE). For all properties on the subject property (shopping center and Tech City Bowl) under existing zoning there is a potential for 135,794 sf gross floor area (gfa) commercial and 508 residential units (59 affordable housing).</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B. Establish BT Neighborhood Center Zoning including an increase in building height to 65'; allow housing on ground floor. For 5 stories estimated redevelopment potential: 108,635 sf gfa commercial 108,635 sf office Residential: 1,197 units (100 affordable)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Staff Recommendation:</td>
<td>Support an increase in building height to 5 stories in order to support higher-quality retail at center and increased transit service, which are major community objectives for the area. Have a tiered approach to building height and form across entire subject property that is compatible with existing 3 story multi-family uses to the east and south perimeters that is RM 3.6 zoning; 30' ABE height limit. Could consider a 55' maximum building height (15' ground floor commercial with 4 stories of residential above (or commercial) (allow increased height for decorative parapets or peaked roofs, mechanical units; as allowed in other commercial zones) similar to NRH 1A zoning (allows 5 stories: 4 stories residential over 1 story commercial) or recently adopted FHNC zoning where zoning allows 55' height, requires some level of property aggregation, grocery store, area for public open space, upper story step back modulation requirements above two stories, greater affordable housing requirements (20% instead of 10%) and green building LEED requirements. The details of the zoning regulations would be developed in 2019.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

ATTACHMENT 2
### Evaluation Criteria

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>10.City - NRH 5 and NRH 6 Zones</strong> Study area NRH 5 and NRH 6 zones on the east side of Slater in North Rose Hill Business District. Includes car storage area and office in support of car dealership, Ridgewood Village condominiums, Slater Park Building including a veterinary office, and an office building located on the corner of Slater Ave NE and NE 120th St. - Increase building height by 2-5 feet to incentivize transition to housing or mixed use office/multifamily and make height limit consistent in both zones, in support of the adopted Housing Strategies, and vision for NRH business district. Continue to allow car related retail and storage. Provides more desirable floor plate in NRH 5 (would allow 13 foot high office use). Study Options: A. No Change - retain current zoning standards: 30 feet above average building elevation for all uses, except in NRH 6, 33 feet above average building elevation for a mixed use office/multifamily use. B. Increase building height to 35' above average building elevation for housing and mixed use office and housing. <strong>Staff recommendation:</strong> Support modest increase in building height, compatible with surrounding multifamily housing, to support future redevelopment into stand-alone multifamily or mixed use office/multifamily development providing housing, affordable housing in the Totem Lake Urban Center close to the Lake WA Institute of Technology and in support of the existing goal and proposed policy for North Rose Hill Business District to ensure type of commercial uses compatible with mixed use residential/commercial focus. Design Guidelines encourage parking lots in less visible areas, and limit commercial uses to those compatible with the residential focus of the NRHBD.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Future redevelopment of the North Rose Hill Neighborhood Center would be complementarity to the Totem Lake Business District, would promote walkability, and could generate new gathering spaces in the neighborhood.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Housing uses and mixed use office and housing would be visually compatible with surrounding housing. 35' buildings would not be substantially taller than surrounding multifamily development that has height limit of 30 feet.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Existing uses with redevelopment potential: In NRH 5 zone-office at corner of NE 120th and Slater (built in 1958) and in southern NRH 5 zone house converted to office in support of car dealership (built in 1914) where land values are &gt; than 50% of improvement value. In NRH 6 zone - Existing office use, including veterinary hospital (built in 1981) where land values are &gt; than 50% of improvement value.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> No mapped wetlands or streams.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Redevlopment of the site into a housing or mixed use residenti al focus promotes the 10 minute neighborhood concept near transit and Totem Lake business es.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Bus route 235 provides service along 124th Avenue NE from Bellevue to Totem Lake and to 5 Kirkland and Downtown Kirkland transit centers. 235 provides service along NE 120th St to Kirkland/Woodi nville and to transit centers Kingsgate and Brickyard Road. - By 2025 more frequent service connection to transit centers is anticipated: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothell.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> Redevelopment would increase housing of all types near Lake WA Institute of Technology (Housing already permitted use but proposal could facilitate redevelopme nt with mixed uses or stand-alone housing; I mpacts on overall affordable housing supply would likely be minimal due to limited redevelopment opportuniti es.</td>
<td><strong>YES</strong> New zoning for future redevelopment would be consistent with land use, housing, and transportation policies to encourage mixed use development and housing.</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong> Redevelopment could displace car dealership car storage, or encourage more efficient car storage configurati ons.</td>
<td><strong>NO</strong> Comment received from NRH 5 Ridgewood Village Condos HOA president. No comments received from other three property owners in study area. Public notice will be sent prior to public hearing to all owners and residents within 300 feet of study area.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Building Height Comparisons
Rose Hill/Bridle Trails Plan Update Project

3 Stories

Boulevard Condominiums
355 Kirkland Avenue
Kirkland, WA

4 Stories

Heathman Hotel
220 Kirkland Avenue
Kirkland, WA

5 Stories

Bank of America
101 Kirkland Avenue
Kirkland, WA
67 Feet

Salix at Juanita Village
9736 NE 119th Way
Kirkland, WA

75 Feet

Kirkland Urban
6th Street and Central Way
Kirkland, WA

150 Feet

EvergreenHealth Medical Center
12040 NE 128th Street
Kirkland, WA
Hi Joan and Janice
It is good to see you at open house and sorry you didn’t get my email but here’s my request for my property at 12822 NE 85 Kirkland WA 98033 -To be commercial zoning
- taller building to allow 3 story building 35 feet
- reduce set back
- minimize parking stall requirement
Thank you so much for your help.

Best regards
The cave craft beer and smoke
12822 NE 85TH Kirkland WA 98033
Tel 425 242 0294
Www.cavecraftbeer.com
April 23, 2018

Joan Lieberman-Brill
Senior Planner
Planning & Building Department
City of Kirkland
123 57th Ave.
Kirkland, WA 98033-6189

Dear Joan:

It was a pleasure to meet with you last week to discuss the Lake Washington Institute of Technology's future plans regarding possible housing and how our planning efforts coordinate with the City's long term planning.

Housing for students and/or employees has been a consideration of the College for some time. In 2011, the College conducted a feasibility study on housing. This effort was reviewed with the City's Planning Department (Eric Shield and Tony Leavitt) and we were informed that the College has the right to construct on-campus housing in any location the approved College Master Plan permits.

As a result, it was our understanding that the City considers on-campus housing to be a natural outgrowth of LW Tech's educational mission, and thus permitted outright under the campus' zoning classification. Development would require a formal amendment of the existing Master Plan, a process that would be expected to take six months to complete.

However, given the limited footprint the College currently has, and per our conversation, we are going to pursue the possibility of some form of development of the existing greenbelt located immediately west of the campus. We fully understand the potential limits to any development and will certainly discuss with you the outcome of our environmental assessment.

In summary, long-term future facility and space planning for Lake Washington Institute of Technology does include the possibility of student/employee housing and would request this be included in any planning considerations for the City for the North Rose Hill area.

We would be glad to provide any additional information regarding LW Tech's future plans. Please let me know if there are any questions.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Dr. Amy Morrison Goings
President
Hi Joan/Adam,

It was great talking to you on Saturday, it was a very informative workshop! Adam asked me to send a written submission of my suggestions so please consider this email my formal submission.

As I mentioned, I live at 8527 126th Ave NE. The 4 lots in this community have original houses (1960s) and are directly north to the commercial zone on NE 85th St. Because of the age of the houses, if the city wishes to reshape/rezone this "transitional" area, this particular block would be a great candidate for further development. Around this particular area, there are a few new constructions - all of which are SFH of around ~3200-3300 sqft. Directly east of my property, DGR Development is almost finished with 4 new residences (SUB16-02513, and SUB16-02514). A couple of houses north of that, Merit Homes is starting the application for 3 new residences (LLA16-03092, SUB16-03093). It seems every new construction pretty much tries to maximize their FAR to be as close to 50% as possible. For this area, houses of this size translate to a sell price at (current) market prices of around ~$1.5-$1.6 million. Without any changes/rezoning, I imagine any further investment by developers in this block would consist of houses in the 3300-3500 range, decreasing affordability for a block that has great accessibility: Safeway and Walgreens across NE 85th St, Costco a few blocks away, a number of coffee shops, a number of different restaurants all within a 5-minute walk, a child care center across the street (Kiddy Academy) and less than 5 minutes from 405. With the proposed Rose Hill Mixed Use project just a few blocks west of this block and the Public Transit plans on 405, this area will only become more vibrant.

Because of the reasons above, I think increasing density in this "transition" area would benefit the community in the long term. A mixed-use zoning change would not only provide affordable living (apartments/condos) in an accessible zone but also add additional space for further retail. If mixed-use is deemed as not necessary for this block, changing it to a medium density zone would allow developers to pack more (smaller) houses in these lots - most likely a set of town homes, which would be much more affordable than current new construction SFH in the area.

For example, my lot is 14,000 sqft but of the easement that provides access to my 3 neighbors and because the access easement does not count towards lot size (is this something that I could apply for an exception?), my lot is effectively around 10,000 sqft (for the purposes of subdivision). This means only a single home can be built on this lot (with a fairly large yard though!). My neighbor to the south has the same predicament: their lot is 10,400 sqft which means it also does not meet minimum size requirements for subdivision.

When I talked to Adam, I mentioned to him I’d also chat with my neighbors about this. I'll ask them to submit their thoughts, if they have any.

Thanks for your time!
Jin
Hi Jen,

We will be considering candidate transition areas bordering the existing Rose Hill Business District, but don’t yet know where these will be.

We will be exploring this topic at the Saturday, June 2 public workshop that will be held at the Lake Washington Institute of Technology from 11-2. At that time we will receive feedback from workshop attendees on a draft vision statement for the combined Rose Hill neighborhoods/NE 85th St. Subarea and a separate vision statement for the Bridle Trails neighborhood.

We will also have exercises to find out where along the commercial corridor there are desired locations for increased housing density. The City Council has given strong direction to study increasing opportunities for housing in strategic areas to address the need for more housing and affordable housing, during neighborhood plan updates. You will have an opportunity to suggest locations where you think it would be appropriate at the workshop.

We look forward to seeing you on June 2nd.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP

Senior Planner

Kirkland Planning & Building Department

425-587-3254

jbrill@kirklandwa.gov

Mon – Thus
Hi Joan/Kaylee,

I just learned about the ongoing planning for the Rose Hill area. I was reading through document http://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/North+South+Rose+Hill+$!26+Bridle+Trails+Neighborhood+Plan+Update+Memo+with+Attachments+WEB+-+CAM18-00082.pdf and I had a couple of questions regarding the NE 85th St Subarea.

I live at 8527 126th Ave NE which lies just north of the RH 5A area. This block is currently zoned as RS 7.2

Reading the planning update, it sounds like there's a desire to revisit the land-use of the areas along the 85th corridor. Would my property fall under this "transitional area"? If so, do you have any information to share regarding what kind of changes the planning department is considering?

Thanks,

Jin

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello,

I would like to request the following properties located in South Rose Hill within the NE 85th St Subarea. Be zoned to allow for commercial use.

The properties are commonly Known as:

8241 122nd Ave. NE
8245 122nd Ave. NE
8249 122nd Ave. NE
8251 122nd Ave. NE

Thank you,
Martin Morgan
425-443-1988
Hello,
As a property owner on 122nd Ave NE in the South Rose Hill neighborhood, I would like to see much higher density, including expanded commercial, between 120th Ave NE and 124th Ave NE north of the Kirkland Cemetery to NE 85th Street. This would create a more walkable, multi-modal area to take advantage of the upcoming BRT on the 85th/405 street overpass and would help maintain the single family residential feel in the rest of the neighborhood from NE 80th Street south by concentrating the density along NE 85th Street.

Thank you!
Sharon Morgan
July 6, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Planning & Building Department
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033-6189

Re: Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update

Dear Joan:

We are writing on behalf of LMJ Enterprises, LP, owner of the property located at the southeast quadrant of the I-405 interchange at NE 85th Street (the “Property”). A vicinity map and relevant Property information are attached to this letter. The Property comprises zones 2A, 2B and 2C in the Rose Hill Business District in the Kirkland Zoning Code (the “Code”).

Earlier this year, the City initiated a process to update the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan, within which the Property is located. We are writing to request that as part of the Plan Update, the City consider certain changes to the Code to provide for some limited additional height and density for the Property. In addition, with the upcoming Sound Transit Rapid Ride station to be located at the adjacent interchange, we believe it is timely to consider a process for future transit-oriented development (TOD) of the Property. Our suggestions are set forth in the attached memorandum.

The Property is uniquely located to support such potential redevelopment. It is located at the intersection of an interstate highway and a major arterial. The future Sound Transit facility will connect it directly to the regional high-capacity transit system. The Property is of sufficient size to accommodate a meaningful mixed-use development while at the same time providing appropriate scale transitions to neighboring sites to the south.

As our regional light rail and high-capacity transit network builds out across the Puget Sound area, it is critical for cities to make smart use of well-located sites like this one to provide for future residential and job growth. Sites like this that can accommodate urban density need to be zoned for it, both to make good use of our investment in rail and to reduce redevelopment pressure on

valuable single-family neighborhoods. Once a site is redeveloped, it is removed from our land use inventory for generations. Thus, it is important to get the density equation right today.

For this reason, we are making recommendations both for some modest immediate increases in height and density for the site, to bring those heights in line with prevailing development patterns on similar sites in the region. But we are also recommending adopting special overlay provisions that will create a process to consider an urban TOD proposal at this location, so that this potential opportunity is not lost.

We appreciate your consideration of these suggestions and we look forward to participating in the Plan Update process in the months ahead.

Sincerely,

John C. McCullough

JMc:Idc

cc: Tod Johnson
LEE JOHNSON CHEVROLET PROPERTY

Principal Address: 11845 NE 85th St, Kirkland, WA 98033
Lee Johnson Chevrolet Property
I-405 & NE 85th Street

Zoning Recommendations
July 2018

Key Site Characteristics

- Large site adjacent to I-405 (9.7 acres)
- Limited land use compatibility issues
- Superior access to I-405 and arterial system
- Adjacent to future regional high-capacity transit station

Objectives

- Implement transit-oriented development (TOD) zoning
- Provide for short-term and long-term redevelopment options
- Coordinate building heights with building code allowances for mixed-use projects

Proposal

1. **Increase Heights Consistent with market and code allowances**
   - Increase heights from 67'/45'/33' (north/middle/south) to 75' across entire site; site planning can address transition issues
   - This height matches building code allowances. 75' equates to “5 over 2” construction
   - 5-over-2 multifamily projects (75’) are common in urban markets throughout the region (see attached examples)
   - This height increase allows for more housing, more efficient development in the short term
   - These changes would roughly allow for an additional 400 units (+/-) of new housing, beyond the approximately 800 units that current zoning might support

2. **Provide for TOD Overlay Zoning**
   - Create a new overlay zone in the Code, available only for sites larger than 5 acres, located on a major arterial within ¼ mile of a high-capacity transit station
   - Sites within the overlay can use existing zoning or opt to seek Master Plan approval under the overlay
   - Master Plan application would be reviewed per Chapter 142 of the Zoning Code
- Master Plan includes site plan, open space/landscaping plan, circulation plan, access plan, impact mitigation and phasing plan over 10 +/- years (long enough to accommodate more than one development cycle, in case a recession intervenes)
- TOD Overlay allows 160' heights for residential office/retail (see examples of 160'-tall buildings)
- Mix of uses would be determined by the market, but must include some neighborhood-serving retail uses
- Final City Council approval is by Development Agreement, which would govern public benefits, mitigation and project phasing/vesting
- A predominantly residential project under this overlay could produce 2400 units, though a mixed-use scenario with more office, hotel and retail would reduce this number
Examples of 75-foot mixed use apartment buildings

AXLE APARTMENTS
Interbay, Seattle
Lennar Multifamily

THE WHITAKER APARTMENTS
West Seattle
Lennar Multifamily Communities
AVA CAPITOL HILL
Capitol Hill, Seattle
AvalonBay Communities

MODERA CAPITOL HILL
Capitol Hill, Seattle
Mill Creek Residential
SPRING DISTRICT APARTMENTS
Bellevue, Washington
Security Properties

MODA APARTMENTS
Belltown, Seattle
Equity Residential
Examples of 160-foot buildings

Coppins Well Apartments
First Hill, Seattle
Holland Development

1001 Minor Avenue Apartments
First Hill, Seattle
Holland Development
The Danforth Apartments
Madison & Broadway, Seattle
Columbia Pacific

300 Terry Avenue N. Hotel
South Lake Union, Seattle
Stanford Hotels
Google Buildings (Podium office + residential tower)
South Lake Union, Seattle
Vulcan

Alto Apartments
Belltown, Seattle
Harbor Urban
Urban Union  
South Lake Union, Seattle  
Schnitzer West

Polyclinic on Madison  
First Hill, Seattle  
HAL Real Estate
September 13, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Planning Commission
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033-6189

Re: Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are writing on behalf of LMJ Enterprises, LP, owner of the property located at the southeast quadrant of the I-405 interchange at NE 85th Street (the “Property”). The Property comprises zones 2A, 2B and 2C in the Rose Hill Business District in the Kirkland Zoning Code (the “Code”).

In July, we presented suggestions to the Planning Commission regarding further refinements to the zoning proposal for the Property. This has been carried forward as #6 in your staff report to the Planning Commission dated August 4, 2018 (the “Staff Report”). We have had an opportunity to review the Staff Report and wanted to offer the following comments:

- We strongly endorse the recommendation to allow this proposal to proceed to public hearing.
  - It is important that the additional height apply to a large enough portion of the site to make a real density difference.
  - We also believe that the lot coverage and parking requirements for the site need to be addressed.

- For the longer-term proposal (160’ heights), we suggest that waiting until the transit station is complete to consider this proposal may be too late. Planning, permitting and construction of a major project takes 5 years at least. That is close to the time window within which the transit station will be complete. Market interest in more substantial development of the site will begin before the transit center opens, not afterward. It is important to create the vision now, or else the site may just be developed as wood-frame 75’ product. At that point, the higher density alternative is lost.
Our proposal would create a path to a higher density plan now, but the path would not be certain. It would be enough to attract interest—serious interest—in the plan now, before lower-density options take over. But by involving the City Council in final decision-making, continuing high levels of City scrutiny would be assured.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to the public hearing.

Sincerely,

John C. McCullough

JMho

cc: Tod Johnson
    Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
    Janice Coogan
July 13, 2018

Janice Coogan
City Planner
City of Kirkland Planning and Building Department
123 5th Ave
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Ms Coogan:

We are writing to you as the developer of five parcels making up the RH 3 zone located at 12040 NE 85th Street. The King County parcel numbers for the property are as follows:

- 1238500110
- 1238500115
- 1238500125
- 1238500135
- 1238500140

This transit oriented development will be adjacent to the future I-405 BRT station and will provide over 200,000 square feet of retail including grocery, drug store and fitness center. Above the retail and underground parking structure, there will be four 5-6 level residential buildings totaling approximately 740 residential units with 10% being designated as affordable housing.

The design team and ourselves are excited about our design for this project, and optimistic on how it will contribute to transforming the Rose Hill Corridor District into a vibrant 24-hour neighborhood. Our vision is not only to provide retail and restaurants, health club, and apartment homes, but to create a place where people will truly want to congregate, visit, and enjoy the public spaces. We envision a place for residents to meet friends and family, to enjoy the surroundings and services, and for visitors to enjoy the plazas and gardens. In addition to the public amenities at ground level, we plan to provide residential amenities on the rooftops. This will include exterior plazas with generous landscaping providing opportunities for casual seating and barbecues. To successfully provide these pedestrian public spaces as well as the rooftop amenities areas, the design team is proposing two zoning code amendments for the Rose Hill 3 zone.
As part of the Rose Hill 3 Neighborhood Plan update process, we would like the City of Kirkland to consider the following code amendments to help achieve a vibrant urban mixed-use project:

**Increase Lot Coverage of the RH3 Zone to 100%**

With the construction of the I-405 BRT station at NE 85th St, we believe Kirkland will benefit from transit oriented developments such as ours. With almost 800 residential units including low income housing, our Rose Hill development will bring urban density with retail anchors that can support the daily needs of its residents and the surrounding communities. For providing this density, our project will be providing a large public plaza and vegetated hill climb to serve as a public gathering space. We believe these elements will be valuable public amenities and serve as the heart of this future urban neighborhood.

Examples of higher density include Totem Lake, Yarrow Bay, and the Central Business District. In Totem Lake (TL 1B) lot coverage of 85% can be increased by providing superior landscaping on lower portions of structures or rooftop, visual and pedestrian access to public gardens, or other approaches that provide for usable green space (KMC 55.15.050.5.b). The Central Business District (CDB 8) allows 100% lot coverage along Central Way. Here the stacked residential is supported by retail and restaurant attractions that will make this business corridor a highlight of Kirkland’s urban living. Lastly, Yarrow Bay (YBD 1) allows for 100% lot coverage next to the South Kirkland Park and Ride. Here Kirkland Crossing and Velocity Apartments create a high-density transit oriented development which provides the public with a landscaped plaza connection through the site.

**Increase the Allowable Height Limit from 67'-0" to 75'-0"**

We propose that the RH3 zoning regulations be modified to increase the overall building height by 8'-0" to allow for decorative parapets, roof plaza paving systems, open railings, and landscape planters. This increase to the allowable height would not increase the number of floors but instead allow for increased flexibility of architectural forms at the roof line. Roof modulation afforded by varying parapet heights enhances the building elevations by supporting the exterior design composition and providing visual interest from the surrounding community. Lastly, the quality and feasibility of roof top amenity areas will be dependent upon design elements such as plaza paving, opening railings and planters. Rooftop amenity areas will allow tenants to relax and barbeque in a
July 13, 2018
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park like setting while enjoying the surrounding views which is a hallmark of desirable residential buildings.

**Decrease the required parking for Residential**

We propose that the RH3 zoning regulations be modified to decrease the parking requirements for mixed use developments containing multi-family residential use and retail uses. The land-use portion of the Kirkland comprehensive plan lists the importance of new innovative developments and changing household needs. We believe there will be a major reduction in car ownership as a result of car sharing services and expanding mass transit. The proximity of the planned new I-405 BRT station will provide a direct connection with downtown Bellevue which will make Seattle and other employment centers accessible via light rail. The BRT station makes our project a transit oriented development, and most all jurisdictions reduce the parking requirements for Transit oriented development. Specifically, the Kirkland comprehensive plan policy LU – 3.7 states that a reduction in parking requirements should be considered for walkable areas with convenient shops services and good transit service. The design team and project developer foresee the realistic parking demand to be lower than the parking requirements currently applicable to the RH3 zone. We have asked our traffic consultant to prepare a parking study that will forecast the parking demand for the RH3 zone. We will share that study with you as soon as it is finished. In the meantime, we request that you begin the amendment process holding open the exact parking ratios that will apply to the RH3 zone.

We hope that the City of Kirkland will support these modifications to the RH3 zoning regulations. The proposed revisions are consistent with many of the policies in the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan related to Community Character, Climate Change, Land Use (especially Land Use/Transportation Linkages), and the NE 85th Street Subarea. Policy NE85-3.5 provides for utilizing zoning incentives or other techniques to encourage commercial redevelopment in the Subarea. The requested amendments do precisely that as they will enable us to provide the City with a marquee project at the doorstep to its new rapid transit station. Thank you for your consideration.

Sincerely,

Jim Gallaugher
Principal
ZONING CODE

SECTION 51.32 - GENERAL REGULATIONS

1. Refer to Chapter 1, ZKC to determine what other provisions of this code may apply to the subject property.

2. Within required front yards, canopies and similar entry features may encroach provided that the total horizontal dimensions of such elements may not exceed 55 percent of the length of the structure.

3. Individual retail uses in this zone are limited to a maximum gross floor area of 65,000 square feet.

4. At least 50 percent of the total gross floor area located on the ground floor of all structures on the subject property must contain retail establishments, restaurants, taverns, hotels or motels. These uses shall be oriented to NE 88th Street, a major pedestrian walkway or an internal pathway.

5. The ground floor of all structures on the subject property shall be a minimum of 15 feet in height. This requirement does not apply to:
   a. The following uses: Vehicle service stations, automotive service centers, private lodges or clubs, attached or stacked dwelling units, churches, schools, daycare centers, mini-schools or mini-daycare centers, assisted living facilities, convalescent centers or nursing homes, public utilities, government facilities or community facilities.
   b. Parking Garages.
   c. Additions to existing nonconforming development where the planning official determines it is not feasible.

6. The Public Works Official shall approve the number, location and characteristics of driveways on NE 88th Street in accordance with the driveway and sight distance policies contained in the Public Works pre-approved Plans manual. Taking into consideration the characteristics of this corridor, the Public Works official may:
   a. Require access from side streets and/or
   b. Encourage properties to share driveways, circulation and parking areas, and/or
   c. Restrict access to bright lum in and out, or
   d. Prohibit access altogether along NE 88th Street.

7. Some development standards or design regulations may be modified as part of the design review process. See Chapter 92 and 142 ZKC for requirements.

8. Access for drive-thru facilities must be approved by the Public Works official. See ZKC 105.96 for requirements.

9. A through-block pedestrian pathway shall be installed pursuant to the through-block pathway standards in ZKC 105.19; see Plate 34:
   a. Along the north portion of the zone to make an east-to-west pedestrian connection between 12th Avenue NE and 12th Avenue NE as designated in the Comprehensive Plan; and
   b. Connecting the north end of the zone to NE 88th Street.

10. For lighting requirements associated with development, see ZKC 118.8(M).
SITE ANALYSIS

1. U-Haul
2. Costco
3. 76 Gas Station
4. Avis Office Building
5. Arris Building
6. Mercury’s Coffee
7. Rose Hill Plaza
8. McDonalds
9. Honda of Kirkland
10. Taco Time
11. Starbucks
12. Walgreens
13. Safeway
14. Lee Johnson Mazda
15. Kirkland Retail & Car Center
16. Kirkland Court
17. Jiffy Lube
18. Jomesco Business Park
19. Rose Hill Presbyterian Church

Transit

- Kirkland Way Park & Ride
- Primary Transit Network
- Secondary Transit Network
- Planned Bus Rapid Transit Route
- Bus Stop
Janice Coogan

From: Daniel Weise <daniel@weises.org>
Sent: Monday, March 26, 2018 1:31 PM
To: Janice Coogan
Cc: Daniel Weise
Subject: Redoing of comprehensive plan for Bridle Trails (and 3 related neighborhoods)

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Janice,

My family got the postcard for the upcoming neighborhood meeting. Unfortunately, I cannot make that meeting. I was looking at the existing comprehensive plan for Bridle Trails at http://www.codepublishing.com/WA/Kirkland/cgi/NewSmartCompile.pl?path=html/KirklandCP15C/KirklandCP15C.html. I assume that this is the existing comprehensive plan and not the proposed one.

I'm writing about the part of the plan that says

**Bridlewood Circle, Silver Spurs Ranch, and Bridle View should remain at a very low residential density.**

Bridlewood Circle, Silver Spurs Ranch, and Bridle View areas should remain very low density (one dwelling unit per acre) with private stable facilities permitted on these large lots.

Of particular interest to me is the definition of “Silver Spurs Ranch”, which has historical anomalies associated with it. In particular, the 3 properties along its northern edge (as defined by Figure BT-3) 6422 128th Ave NE, 6425 128th Ave NE, and 6424 126th Ave NE, are not really part of Silver Spurs because they cannot be accessed from NE 60th, they must be accessed from NE 70th. Including them in the LDR 1 zoning of Silver Spurs makes no sense, they should be included in the LDR 5 of the properties to their north and east. You can see this zoning change was done to create 12509 NE 65th and 12512 NE 65th abutting Kent Sullivan’s on the north (6407 126th Ave NE). (If my memory is correct, Kent carved these northern lots off of the property he used to build his own house.)

What process should I follow to ensure that any comprehensive plan no longer places these properties within Silver Spurs, thereby making it much easier to short plat these properties in the future as LDR5? We need to be increasing the density of housing in Kirkland to help keep housing affordable. Undoing this mistake of history is one way to improve density.

Daniel Weise
Silver Spurs Resident
12810 NE 64th St.
Owner, 6422 128th Ave NE.

PS, I have chatted with the owner of 6425 128th Ave NE many times over the years and know of his interest in building more units than currently allowed. I have no idea the druthers of the owner of the 3rd lot, but as that lot is not nearly as buildable as the other two, I wouldn’t be surprised if that owner is not interested in this idea.
June 28, 2018

Janice Coogan  
Senior Planner  
City of Kirkland Planning and Building Department  
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland WA 98033

RE: Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan Update

Dear Janice:

We are writing to you as the owners of the Tech Bowl (Totem Bowl) and Bridle Trails Shopping Center (ROIC).

As part of the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan update process, we would like the City of Kirkland to consider changes to the Zoning Code to allow higher density residential, and a mix of commercial and retail uses at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center and Tech Bowl properties.

They include the following addresses and parcel numbers.

**Totem Bowl**  
Address: 13033 NE 70th Place & 13005 NE 70th Place – Kirkland, WA  
Parcel Numbers: 124150-0265, 124150-0276, 124150-0277

**Bridle Trails Shopping Center**  
Address: 6501 132nd Ave NE – Kirkland, WA  
Parcel Number: 124150-0310

We believe the following standards would be important elements to achieve a successful vibrant redevelopment of the collective properties in the future:

- Increase of overall height limits to 65 feet to facilitate midrise mixed-use buildings;
- Use modulation, upper building setbacks and material changes to breakdown overall scale.
- Allow for residential amenities on the rooftop of mixed use buildings, which may exceed the suggested height limit of 65 feet.
- Increased flexibility to meet retail/commercial uses at ground floor.
- Allow residential uses at ground floor of buildings.
- Participation in affordable housing at a maximum of 20% of all residential units at an
affordability level at 80% AMI defined by King County MFTE guidelines.

- Flexibility in minimum parking requirements for mixed use developments.
- Encourage pedestrian oriented environment by use of wider sidewalks and small plazas at the street level that allow retail uses to spill out and activate.

We think the City of Kirkland should support these changes in zoning for this area, as this is the logical place to encourage increased density while preserving the existing scale and character of the surrounding single-family neighborhoods. These changes will provide the economic catalyst to change the current one level commercial environment into a neighborhood village that better serves this area and encourages a vibrant pedestrian experience.

Thank you for consideration the proposed changes.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

Don Wells
Totem Bowl and Investment Inc.

[Signature]

Richard Schoebel
Chief Operating Officer
Retail Opportunity Investments Corp. (ROIC)
Thank you Joan,

I apologize but at this short of notice, we are not able to attend the meeting this evening. I’ll look at the future meeting dates.

If this question should arise in future meetings, here is our answer: should the College receive funding to develop employee and/or student housing we are primarily intending for this housing to be for our employees and/or students. We may consider other public sector employees should the need/partnership arise. Again, we have no such funding at this time to building such employee or student housing. However, at this time we would like the option to construct such housing as the City is reviewing the Rose Hill plan.

Thank you again Joan,
Amy

Dr. Amy Morrison Goings | President

Lake Washington Institute of Technology
Office of the President | West Building 301
11605 132nd Avenue NE | Kirkland, WA 98034
T: (425) 739-8200 | amy.goings@lwtech.edu
www.LWTeach.edu | @LWTechPrez

Hi Thomas and Amy,

I wanted to follow-up with you on the September 13 Planning Commission Study Session regarding the Commission’s questions and comments on the requested policy change by LWIT to allow market rate in addition to affordable housing and to allow encroachment into the greenbelt easement on the west side of your campus. First of all, they recommended that your proposal proceed to public hearing on October 25.

However, Commissioners had questions regarding both the Institute’s intentions for developing housing on campus and to whom the housing would be targeted. I had forwarded the email from Thomas to the Commission that is referred to below on September 6th. Nevertheless, the Planning Commission was not clear on your future intentions, and I
recommend that you clarify further, as I understand it, that you have no immediate plans and would like the flexibility to
determine whether you want to solely accommodate students and staff or open the housing up to the broader
community in the future, that there are state funding challenges regarding incorporating housing (of any kind) into a
new master plan when the current one expires, and that your future timeframe for adding housing to your campus,
should funding become available, is not known at this time.

They also had questions for the City staff regarding whether there is any legal requirement that would prevent policies
being included in the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan that would limit housing to student/staff campus housing. The City
Attorney’s office believes that some amount of restriction would be legal and is continuing to research this issue. In the
meantime I would suggest that you look into this on your end so there is agreement between your sources and the City’s
determination on this question.

I would encourage you to attend the upcoming City Council public meeting tonight, and the City Council October 2 public
meeting and Planning Commission October 25 public hearing to be available to provide the City Council and the Planning
Commission information should they have questions (either the same questions or additional).

The purpose of the Sept 18th meeting (tonight) is to review the draft Plans for Rose Hill (including policies addressing
LWIT) and Bridle Trails. Please follow this link to the first draft of the Rose Hill Plan and go to page 12, which contain all
the policies for LWIT. The housing policy is RH-50 and the expansion into greenbelt is RH 51. You may view the staff
memorandum that will be considered by the City Council tonight by following this link. The agenda can be viewed by
following this link.

The purpose of the October 2 City Council meeting is to get concurrence from the City Council on the Planning
Commission’s (PC’s) recommendations (made at the PC’s September 13 study session), on which of the requests to
change land use designations or policies /zoning/ or development regulations should advance to public hearing. No
decision will be made on the actual request. The staff memo will be available on the City Council website on Friday,
September 28.

The City Council meetings start at 7:30 PM in the Council Chambers.
The Planning Commission meetings start at 7:00 in Council Chambers.

Sincerely

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Kirkland Planning & Building Department
425-587-3254
jbrill@kirklandwa.gov
Mon - Thus

From: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 11:11 AM
To: ‘Thomas, Bill’ <Bill.Thomas@lwtech.edu>
Cc: Goings, Amy <Amy.Goings@lwtech.edu>; Janice Coogan <JCcoogan@kirklandwa.gov>; Adam Weinstein
<AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: RE: Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan

Hi Thomas,
Thanks for the response. I will forward it to the Planning Commission since it is too late to include in the Meeting Packet prepared for the Planning Commission meeting on September 13. The meeting packet will be available on the Planning Commission webpage by Friday September 7th. At the meeting staff will be asking for direction on which requests for land use change, rezone, or code amendment associated with the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan and Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan should move forward to the public hearing. I do encourage you to attend that meeting at 7 pm in the Council Chambers at City Hall (123 5th Avenue) to provide oral support for your proposal.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Kirkland Planning & Building Department
425-587-3254
jbrill@kirklandwa.gov
Mon - Thus

From: Thomas, Bill [mailto:Bill.Thomas@lwtech.edu]
Sent: Tuesday, September 04, 2018 3:42 PM
To: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Cc: Goings, Amy
Subject: Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan

Joan, the position of Lake Washington Institute of Technology regarding potential housing on campus remains the same as we outlined in the attached letter. This is only under consideration at this point by the College and would be part of a longer term facilities plan. There are no immediate short-term plans by the College for housing on campus nor an immediate request by the College to change zoning regulations. While our long term plans for housing would be primarily intended to address housing for our employees and students, there could be consideration given to others depending on partnerships and funding. But, at this early point, Lake Washington recognizes that any effort for housing on campus is going to require a significant number of years and funding support not currently available by the College.

I hope this helps clarify the College’s thoughts on housing on our campus. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Bill Thomas
Vice President, Administrative Services
Lake Washington Institute of Technology
11605 132nd Avenue NE
Kirkland, WA 98034
bill.thomas@lwtech.edu
425.739.8201

From: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 10:33 AM
To: amy.goings@lwtech.edu
Subject: LWIT Request for Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan policy change
Hi Amy,

The update of the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan is moving forward with a Planning Commission meeting scheduled for September 13 on the land use/rezone/zoning regulation or policy change requests initiated by stakeholders or staff proposals, in order to provide a preliminary recommendation on which ones move forward to public hearing in October. These requests were introduced to the Planning Commission in July. I’m not sure if you have been following this update – here is a link to the Planning Commission website to view the staff memo that was considered at the July 26 Planning Commission study session when all requests were introduced, along with the first draft of the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Plans. Scroll down to “Meeting Information” for July 26 and you may download the meeting packet Part 1, 2, and 3.

At that study session they provided feedback and had a few questions on the requested changes and draft Rose Hill and Bridle Trails plans. Regarding LWIT, they asked for more information about your interest in providing student or staff housing. They wondered generally if there could be any way to restrict tenants to students or staff, which is a question planning staff may explore. In the meantime it would be helpful to confirm if your intention is to limit housing only to those who either attend or work at LWIT and their families. Please respond by August 28 so I can respond to the Planning Commission in a staff memo I’m preparing for the September 13 meeting.

I would also encourage you to attend the upcoming September 13 meeting to follow the discussion on your amendment request. The meeting will begin at 7:00 PM and is held in the Council Chamber at City Hall. If it isn’t possible to attend, you can view the meeting live by going to the Planning Commission Meetings Online website. The staff memorandum that will be considered by the Planning Commission will be available for viewing on September 7, the Friday prior to the meeting, by following this link to the Planning Commission website and scrolling down to “Meeting Information” for that date.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Kirkland Planning & Building Department
425-587-3254
jbrill@kirklandwa.gov
Mon – Thus

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Joan Lieberman-Brill

From: Mary Lou Walen <mlwalen@gmail.com>
Sent: Wednesday, September 19, 2018 9:07 AM
To: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Subject: Re: Kirkland proposal to change land use policy at car storage site at 11680 Slater Avenue (adjoining Ridgewood Village Condominium)

Good morning,

At the September 17, 2018 Board Meeting Monday evening, After lengthy discussion and a determination that they wanted to look at the issue more thoroughly including attending any open meetings on the issue, the RVHOA Board decided to send the following message:

We will not oppose the "update the North Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan and consideration of new policies for property near or adjoining the Ridgewood Village Condominium".

Please let me know if this will work for your needs at present.

Thank you for your communications - you are very thorough, efficient & appreciated. Mary Lou

On Sun, Sep 16, 2018 at 8:58 PM Joan Lieberman-Brill <JLiebermanBrill@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Dear Mr. Walen

I left a message for you today and am following up with this email. (Mary Lou Walen provided me your email address.)

I’m contacting you to inform you of a proposal by the City of Kirkland to update the North Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan and to consider new policies for property across the street from your car dealership along Slater Avenue NE, where you have a car storage lot adjoining the Ridgewood Condominiums. The proposed policies are for the North Rose Hill Business District (NRH) 5 and 6 zones, located along Slater Avenue NE in the North Rose Hill Neighborhood. The map below shows where these two zones are located.

One of the RH5 zones is your property where car storage is located adjoining the Ridgewood Village property. The proposal for the NRH 5 zone is to promote the conversion of retail uses related to vehicle
storage and sales to mixed use office/multifamily or high density stand-alone housing by allowing a modest height increase as an incentive. The idea is to consider changing the height limit from 30 to 35 feet as an incentive to convert to a use more compatible with the surrounding housing. We understand that there is no active proposal to redevelop your property or change the use, but this policy may encourage conversion to more compatible uses in the future. If the zoning amendments move forward, the car storage use would remain until a change is proposed by either you or the property owners at the Ridgewood Village. A similar policy is being proposed for the NRH 6 zone where the Animal Hospital is located, to promote either office/multifamily or stand-alone housing by allowing a height increase as an incentive. Again the idea is to increase the height by 5 feet to provide an incentive for transition from stand-alone office to housing or mixed use office and housing, and to match the height being proposed in NRH 5.

As background, this proposal is part of the North Rose Hill, South Rose Hill, Bridle Trails and NE 85th Street Subarea Plan update project that the City is undertaking, to plan how these neighborhoods will shape growth over the next 20 years. The City Council has directed that the update process for these plans be combined and that we consider creating one Rose Hill Plan for the North Rose Hill, South Rose Hill Neighborhoods and 85th Street Subarea while promoting and recognizing each neighborhood’s unique character. So far there has been support for combining these plans. The Bridle Trails neighborhood plan will remain a stand-alone plan in recognition of its unique equestrian character.

A first draft of the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan (and Bridle Trails Plan) are located on the website. The draft policies are on page 6 and 7 of the Rose Hill Plan as Policies RH 21 and RH 22.

The new plans, including these policies for NRH 5 and NRH 6 will be considered at a Planning Commission public hearing on October 25th. A notice will be sent to you prior to the hearing. You are encouraged to provide written comments to the Planning Commission. You are also encouraged to attend the hearing where you may provide oral or written comments. The Planning Commission will consider the staff recommendation and all public comment and make a recommendation to the City Council. The City Council will make the final decision on the Plan updates, including the policies for NRH 5 and 6 zones in December 2018.

If these policies are approved by the City Council in December, a follow-up Zoning Code amendment to implement the policies would be accomplished in 2019.

Please give me a call soon at 425-587-3254 so I can bring you up to speed regarding this project and answer any questions you may have on the proposed policy changes being considered. I work Monday through Thursday.

Sincerely,
Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP

Senior Planner

Kirkland Planning & Building Department

425-587-3254

jbrill@kirklandwa.gov

Mon – Thus

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hi Tony and Planning Commissioners,

I'm writing in support of the proposed zoning changes to South Rose Hill and Bridle Trails. I support building heights of 5 stories in these areas, the ability for developers to build rooftop amenities and outdoor space for residents, and zero lot lines where needed to make efficient use of the properties (similar to downtown Kirkland).

I believe these changes are necessary to support the inevitable growth in Kirkland and appreciate that density is planned for areas that can support mixed use, including the Bridle Trails shopping area and Rosehill. The Rosehill proximity to the future BRT station is smart and thoughtful way to prepare for the future of the NE 85th St corridor. I also appreciate that Kirkland's mandatory inclusionary housing policy means that these developments will create 10% affordable housing units.

I hope that the decision makers at the city will take into account that people opposed to growth in Kirkland tend to show up more loudly and in greater numbers than those of us who are supportive.

Thanks for considering my input.

Aimee Voelz
Kirkland resident since 1997

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Dear Joan,

I own a single-family home at 13125 NE 84th ST in Kirkland, which is right across the Land Use zoning change study area #2 proposed by the city as part of the Rose Hill neighborhood plan update. I am opposed to making any changes to the zoning for the study area #2. Please retain the current zoning of RS 7.2 for this area.

Even though it is close to the busy NE 85th ST, the NE 84th ST is really a quiet neighborhood street. If the study area #2 zoning is changed from its current RS 7.2 to commercial or high density multi-family, that would severely change the NE 84th ST. Given the proposal of 134 unit apartment complex in North Rose Hill at the intersection of NE 85th ST and 132nd Ave NE, I am worried that similar structure may get proposed right in front of my home. In addition to significant traffic, it will also impact the house prices for my home and the other 11 houses in the Harmon Ridge development that are on the south side of NE 84th ST across the study area.

The eastern side of the study area #2 already has 7 new construction single family homes which were built around 2014/2015. Why change the zoning within 3-4 years of permitting new SFH construction? It seems less likely that those lots will be redeveloped soon. Hence, the city’s proposal of changing its zoning may not result in any development in accordance with City’s intention.

Thanks,

Ajit Varangaonkar
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am on the Board at a Rose Hill neighborhood association, Overlook Village. Although considered a condo association, we are a quiet community of 11 freestanding homes which offer affordable housing in a very expensive Eastside market. Since we share a fence with their property, I am writing to express concern about Lee Johnson's proposal to increase the height and density limits on their property. Concerns include increased noise and traffic although there could be others depending on Lee Johnson's plans. We will already be feeling the effects of the New Bethlehem Project's permanent shelter when it opens as our property shares a fence with that location, too.

Since I am unable to attend tonight's meeting, I felt I should make my concerns known before I can attend the meeting in October.

Thank you.

Sincerely,

Alice Fleck
8020 118th CT NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
I am adamantly opposed to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood which the City of Kirkland agreed to help preserve.

Please amend Policy BT-7 in the Bridle Trails community plan by deleting any reference to changing the current height restriction for buildings in the Bridle Trails shopping center.

Thank you,

Alice F. Prince
6021 136th Ave. NE
Kirkland, WA. 98033

Phone: 425-883-8501
e-mail: afprince42@aol.com
-----Original Message-----
From: Barbara Featherstone [mailto:bwareidaho@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 12:04 AM
To: Adam Weinstein <AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Rezone of Bridle Trails Shopping Center

It is with a great deal of respect that I write to thank you for all your efforts to try and guide the preservation of our special neighborhoods through all the turbulence forced upon them by outside factors.

The Seattle area certainly needs help and infrastructure to accommodate the huge population growth brought about by mega corporations overwhelming our inadequate resources. On the other hand, it is not necessarily the duty of our special communities and neighborhoods to bear this burden at great cost to our own hard earned environment.

I don’t know how long you have lived here, but my family moved to Bridle View in 1985. We raised our children here, supported our local schools and a few years ago under the leadership of Don and Alice Prince helped form and finance the Bridle trails Park Foundation which most certainly saved this inner city gem for future generations to enjoy.

It is therefore with a clear conscience that I ask that you deny the the up zone request being proposed for the Bridle Trails Shopping area. You and I both know that the motive is purely PROFIT. I am pretty sure that the proponents of this up zone have no intention of ever living in the proposed apartments or dealing with the daily traffic and crowds this proposal would bring to this small neighborhood. Several of our old-line stores, restaurants and shops have already been forced out by huge rent and lease increases. Our city is changing, but it is not the responsibility of Kirkland to sacrifice it’s own stable, established neighborhoods to line outside developers’ pockets.

Thanks so very much for your informed decision.

Sincerely,

Barbara Featherstone
13330 NE 61st ST
Kirkland WA, 98033
206-915-8949
NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello,

Thank you for the opportunity to participate in the Neighborhood Plan process.

Here are my comments:

Density: Permit multi-story mixed use development at certain perimeter locations, specifically on the south side of N.E. 85th Street and at the current Bridle Trails Shopping Center site. I can't say how many stories would be permitted at these locations. Height restrictions would vary by location and topography. At Bridle Trails, the proposed six-story rezone is out of scale, in my opinion. Density can also be achieved by encouraging ADU’s on larger lots. ADU’s could take the form of developing a basement into an ADU, adding a story to an existing residence, or an addition to an existing house. I have stayed in a very attractive ADU in North Portland, which is a separate structure from the main house. This ADU fits the older neighborhood perfectly. It seems to me that the Design Review Board plays a key role in encouraging creative development that adds housing density in such a way to provide affordable housing. Creative means to accomplish increasing the inventory of affordable housing exist and should be encouraged. Cohousing and cottages are examples that foster a sense of community, too. Creativity and fitting such development into the character of our treed neighborhood are key.

Bridle Trails Shopping Center site: as mentioned above, I believe a six story building is too tall for this site. I believe that site development should preserve and enhance the provision of "10 minute services" for the neighborhood, to which area residents can walk, bus or bicycle. Small businesses, a full-service grocery, a drug store, hardware store, dry cleaner, postal substation, shoe repair are services and often walk to from my home. Better use can be made of the site than currently exists, especially the environmentally-unfriendly sea of asphalt that is the parking lot. Development of this site should include frontage of some neighborhood services on 30th Avenue N.E. to serve bicyclists, residents of the existing apartments on the west side of 130th, and to take advantage of the public pathway that connects 130th with the Bridle View neighborhood.

Walking: I am a big fan of the City's public pathways and hope they are expanded. I can walk from my home to the Bridle Trails Shopping Center on public pathways. It is my favorite thing about living here.

Equestrian Orientation: Bridle Trails State Park is the jewel in our crown. However, it cannot thrive in a vacuum. Rodney Rutherford brought forward an idea to encourage equestrian-oriented smaller housing units on lots that have sewer service so that those who cannot afford a mini-mansion can enjoy and support the Park and equestrian activities on lots that are large enough to accommodate horses. I would also like to see the equestrian zoning overlay be expanded to the few remaining equestrian properties south and west of Bridle Trails Park.

Snyder's Corner: This site is under-utilized as a Park. I observe it being used mainly for emergency services training. It would be an excellent site for an off-leash dog park and take
pressure off of Bridle Trails Park being used as an off-leash park, which discourages walkers and equestrian use. Since it is not large enough for much parking, it would encourage walking to get there.

Sincerely,

Betsy Lewis
12014 N.E. 65th Street
Kirkland 98033
September 8, 2018

Dear Janice,

I strongly oppose allowing developers to build a six story building at the Bridle Trails shopping center. A three story height restriction is much more in keeping with the surrounding neighborhood. Three stories should be the maximum with no added height allowance for complying with various exceptions. Mixed use development does make sense to me and will help businesses that reflect the needs of our neighborhood prosper. Hopefully ROIC will lease to a better grocery store than Grocery Store Outlet and the Dollar Store which have, in my opinion, degraded our shopping center. I have not patronized these stores since they opened.

Sincerely,
Betz Bernhard

10 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA 98033

Sent from Outlook
Greetings,

We reside in Bridle View at 13206 NE 66th St Kirkland and as immediately the first house on 132nd and 66th (start of Bridle View), we are very strong opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density.

This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood and increase already congested traffic and resulting pollution on the intersection.

The city would be well served by instead focusing on how to improve the current services provided to Bridle View, make Snyder Park more beautiful and useful for the residents and add city sewer to the Bridle View neighborhood.

Thanks,

Bhanu & Sarika
Residents of 13206 NE 66th St, Kirkland, WA, 98033 (Bridle View)
From: Bill Anderson [mailto:bill@btkm.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 11, 2018 10:04 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Bridle Trails Neighborhood plan

Dear Members of the Planning Commission,
I would like to present my concerns for a couple of the proposed changes to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan under consideration.

First, Item 9. I believe that the proposal for a height limit of five stories is too much out of character for the neighborhood. The heights of the apartments bordering the property as well as the mixed use across NE 70th is two stories. I believe that this parcel should adhere to that limit to stay in character. This commercial zone should remain as the sole commercial center primarily for the neighborhood. A large center would become more of a destination for transient patrons and customers and so would increase traffic within the neighborhood. I also believe that allowing rooftop use would bring excess noise to the surrounding quieter residential areas.

Second, Item 8. The Bridle Trails Equestrian overlay was adopted to preserve the unique character of the large lot, equestrian community that is Silver Spurs. Allowing this rezone will begin the erosion of that special area as I believe that once some properties are allowed higher density that eventually more and more will be approved. We the residents worked long with city planners to create this special area and we believe strongly that it should remain intact as it is.

Thank you for your consideration,
William Anderson
12920 NE 64th Street
Kirkland, WA 98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Dear Commissioners,

We are writing to strongly oppose the proposed re-development of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center.

The character of the Bridle Trails community would be negatively impacted by the size and scope of this project. This is an equestrian community of single family homes and a unique lifestyle whose focus has always been preserving the aesthetic of a quiet oasis of trees and wildlife habitat in an area facing the ever-increasing pressure of population growth and the demands which accompany it.

The N.E. 70th Street corridor between Kirkland and Redmond has become increasingly busy and congested, especially during the morning and evening rush hours. We see this in the long lines of cars and the increasing number of commuters who use the smaller side streets to try and bypass the congestion on N.E. 70th, which directly and adversely impacts those neighborhoods. We see this on N.E. 60th every day as it impacts the morning arrivals of kids and parents at Ben Franklin Elementary and creates long lines at the intersections at both ends of N.E. 60th. North and southbound traffic on 132nd N.E., to and from Bellevue through Kirkland, has also contributed to the long lines of cars passing through the N.E. 70th/132nd N.E. intersection. The proposed development of a mixed use and apartment complex will only exacerbate the congestion on both of these streets, especially at the N.E. 70th/132 N.E. intersection.

Another mixed use and apartment development in this area is redundant, given that three of the four corners of N.E. 70th and 132 N.E. are already mixed use sites. One includes the existing apartments behind the former Red Apple market and another has apartments above the businesses on the northeast corner of the N.E. 70th/132nd N.E. intersection. These businesses and apartments have served the community well and are in balance and scale with the low profile aesthetic which complements with the area. The impact of a 65 plus foot apartment complex would visually intrusive and totally out of character with our neighborhood. The increased density and traffic which this project would generate directly contradicts the resident's interests in preserving what has been a traditionally low density, single family, neighborhood. The City and the commuting population are far better served by increasing density along major, multiple lane, transit routes, as the Madison Development Group has presented, rather than allowing out-of-scale developments to negatively impact the character and unique qualities of our smaller residential neighborhoods.

We have lived in Bridle Trails for more than thirty years and moved here because we had horses and, in large part, because of Kirkland's commitment to honor and preserve the...
integrity of the diverse neighborhoods which form the character of our City. We hope the City Council and City planners will continue to honor this commitment.

Respectfully submitted,

Bruce and Alene Patterson
6 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Dear Kirkland Planning Commission,

I am traveling this week so I am unable to attend your Kirkland zoning meeting. However, I am opposed to Policy BT 7. You SHOULD NOT change the heights at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center to 60 feet. It may be good for City Taxes and good for corporations or family wealth of a few, but it is BAD for the citizens of the neighborhood. Bridle Trails is an equestrian neighborhood and has a community feel. I have first hand knowledge of the traffic and other issues that affect the neighborhood as I have a horse property and live on 132nd Ave NE.

I realize Kirkland likes density. But even your decision years ago to allow smaller lot sizes has affected the community. More traffic on 132nd Ave NE, more danger for kids as they walk and ride bikes, more noise pollution and more garbage trucks in serving the high density small lots. Whenever density is increased it leads to LESS OF A NEIGHBORHOOD and more issues that never get resolved.

I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood. It would result in more traffic, less horses, less community, more safety issues, more noise, more pollution and overall be detrimental to citizens.

Please do not make this change as it will have long lasting historic NEGATIVE affects on the Bridle Trails community neighborhood. Listen to the community and think about the NEGATIVE long term affects on citizens of Bridle Trails.

Best regards,

Chris Pearson
13210 NE 61st Street
Kirkland, WA 98033
Re-Zoning Request for Bridle Trails Shopping Center

Please help stop or significantly reduce this plan and any other up zoning plans that have gotten out of control in the opinion of most of the public that lives in or near Bridle Trails Bellevue, and going east to the crossroads. Politicians and developers are not listening to the public. There's some misguided objectives from our elected officials and staff at Bellevue that seem to think maximum tax revenue and maximum growth is how to judge success. You really need to listen to the public. No one. And I mean no one I speak with thinks that the spring green, the Sears Overlake plan or the growth at Crossroads or along this corridor is going to improve the quality of life for the people that live here.

Thank you for listening to one person's opinion.

Sent from Yahoo Mail on Android
Dear City of Kirkland Planning and City of Kirkland Council,

Recently I was saddened and disheartened that the City of Kirkland was interested in changing the soul and character of the Bridle Trails neighborhood. This is an equestrian neighborhood that embraces a community feel with large lots with horses, lots of animals and a State Park.

I currently live on 132nd Avenue on an equestrian horse acre and the traffic has increased significantly the past 15 years due to the higher density that has been allowed by the City of Kirkland over the past 15 years in the surrounding areas. The City has not protected the residents at all that live close to the State Park, Tennis Club or shopping area. By increasing the height and density near the shopping center, the entire feel, character and soul of this neighborhood would be changed. Traffic would increase to unbearable levels. 132nd and NE 70th Street already have 1000's of cars, dump trucks, vehicles traveling to the dump, etc. If the shopping center increases traffic, it will make the area UNSAFE for children, animals, horses and families.

I am strongly opposed to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

Please do NOT change our neighborhood!

Please email me if you have any questions.

Best regards,

Chris Pearson

13210 NE 61st Street
Kirkland, WA 98033
Hello - I am writing to voice my grave concern about the proposed 5-6 story redevelopment of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center.  

I feel this level of density is wildly out of scope of our predominantly single family neighborhood. The proposed development, even if placed in DOWNTOWN Kirkland, would rank as one of the largest and densest uses of land in the actual urban core.

Bridle Trails Shopping Center is not near downtown Kirkland. It is located in a decidedly and purposefully quiet residential area bordered to the south, east, and southwest by a State Park and numerous acre-sized single family parcels, some of which still retain the equine character of the original neighborhood. People still own and ride horses here. The Rose Hill area north of 70th is single family with smaller lot sizes. There are a few apartments, condos, and adult family homes located right next to the shopping center.

The infrastructure of the neighborhood cannot stand the numbers of people and cars such a development would bring. I live on 134th Ave NE and cringe at the thought of all those additional people speeding past my house to get to their apartments or condos. The intersection of 132nd and Old Redmond Road/NE 70th Street would need to be rebuilt to handle the capacity. The Bridle Trails Shopping Center is not well served by transit. Density of the kind proposed by the owners of the shopping center needs to be close to a major transit hub. As the Seattle Times reported recently, the transportation planners are looking to put a major transit hub at 85th and 405, and this is the kind of development that would be a much better fit for that particular area. 85th has density and commercial zoning from 132nd all the way down to downtown.

The owner of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center, ROIC, is a huge company that aims to make a ton of money by building projects like this. They are motivated by profit and have little sense of the neighborhood and its people. They have raised rents for their tenants repeatedly, driving some out of business. They have begrudgingly and minimally maintained the shopping center. They want national chain stores in there instead of local, because they can charge more for rent. Perhaps all of this is part of a long con so they can build bigger. Bridle Trails Shopping Center is kind of a dump, to be honest. The answer to that, however, is not to tear it down and build a 5 or 6 story mixed use development. That is the scale of something you would build downtown, not smack in the middle of a single family neighborhood. Focusing and directing increased density on bustling 85th would be an intelligent move. Increase density, grow, add to your tax coffers, but don’t do it haphazardly.

The City of Kirkland can and should say no to this proposal. The city is supposed to serve its residents and neighbors and listen to their concerns. Residents ought to matter more to a City Council than a mega-corporation’s greedy plans. Make ROIC come back with a better plan. A smaller plan, a plan that takes into account the neighborhood and its residents.

Thank you. I wish I could have come to the meeting tonight, I’m sure it will be well attended.

Christine Wertheimer

Sent from my iPad
Kirkland's high zoning/short platting greed is destroying the South Rose Hill neighborhood; traffic is horrible on 132nd from Microsoft to Totem Lake; and 85th already loud and over used.

Please please do not continue to allow short plats and high density housing in this neighborhood. Kirkland's policy is disastrous. I have bought my house here in 1998 and city policy is literally destroying the quality of life here.

--
Cheers,

/andi

Andi Levin
(415) 462-4490
From: Andi Levin <andi.levin@gmail.com>
Sent: Monday, July 30, 2018 10:41 AM
To: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Subject: Re: I am sooo incredibly against a new high density housing zoning variance on 132nd & 85th

thank you. I'm also equally against changing the zoning for the Bridle Trails Shopping mall to high density housing as well. All of the streets (NE 70th/Old Redmond Road and 132nd Ave NE are *one lane each way."

Kirkland's policy of shortplatting just about every lot requested has created traffic hell in this area - first because the contractors block the roads for weeks on end to connect to the main sewer lines, etc. for, bring in building cranes, etc.

This is made worse by WSDOT's high cost HOV lanes on 405 and 520; as a result literally thousands of people use 132nd, NE 80th St., 140th Ave. NE, and NE 70th as high traffic commuter back roads to Microsoft etc. - and they are all single lanes on each side, not built to carry what should be 405 and 520 traffic.

I bought my house 20 years ago because it was in a residential area - NOT because I wanted to live in an overcrowded high density mess without adequate road infrastructure to support it.

Thank you.

On Mon, Jul 30, 2018 at 10:34 AM Joan Lieberman-Brill <JLiebermanBrill@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Thank you Andi,

Your comment will be transmitted to the Planning Commission and City Council during this process.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP

Senior Planner

Kirkland Planning & Building Department

425-587-3254

jbrill@kirklandwa.gov

Mon – Thus
From: Andi Levin [mailto:andi.levin@gmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, July 28, 2018 8:25 PM
To: Joan Lieberman-Brill
Subject: I am sooo incredibly against a new high density housing zoning variance on 132nd & 85th

Kirkland's high zoning/short platting greed is destroying the South Rose Hill neighborhood; traffic is horrible on 132nd from Microsoft to Totem Lake; and 85th already loud and over used.

Please please do not continue to allow short plats and high density housing in this neighborhood. Kirkland's policy is disastrous. I have bought my house here in 1998 and city policy is literally destroying the quality of life here.

--

Cheers,

/andi

Andi Levin

(415) 462-4490

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.

--
Cheers,

/andi

Andi Levin
(415) 462-4490
Hi Joan,
I live in North Rose Hill and have concerns/questions about the "Land Use Zoning Change Study", mostly concerning the "NE 85th St Subarea" 3. Applicant: Jin.

- What is the timing of this potential study and zoning change?
- Is it on the agenda at the Design Review Board tonight, August 6th?

Thank you in advance for your help.

Best,

Angela Vaitkus
Ms. Coogan,
I am writing concerning proposed changes to the zoning of the Bridle Trails shopping center. I have some major concerns about the requests.

The request to increase maximum building height to 65 feet is grossly out of scale with the area and neighboring communities. This parcel is surrounded by low density and low rise properties. Buildings of 65 feet would adversely disrupt the architectural character of the neighborhood.

Modifying existing parking standards with an increase in density is a bad idea in this area due to traffic and transit concerns. The area is served by only two connecting arterials, both of which are a single lane only. West bound NE 70th has been known to back up past 148th Avenue NE at the evening rush hour. Additional traffic will further strain these roads. Also, if inadequate parking is provided there is no alternative for parking or access. There is little street parking for overflow and the area is poorly served by public transit, requiring visitors and residents to drive.

This part of Kirkland, with its equestrian and rural character, is a unique and special neighborhood of the city. Any future development of this property within it must not detract from what makes this neighborhood so special.

Thank you,
- Bill Anderson
12920 NE 64th
Kirkland, WA 98033
Hi Joan:

We are Brendan & Courtney Mahoney and live in South Rose Hill at 8054 122nd Ave NE. We've recently become aware of an application for rezone of our residential street by Martin and Sharon Morgan to allow increased density and mixed-use. This application for rezone would have a direct impact on us, as this application is for the area directly North and adjacent to our home off of 122nd Ave. We are very concerned about this proposal and against it because of safety, traffic, and parking issues on an already overcrowded and overused street.

Our home is on 122nd Ave across from the Kirkland Cemetery, which is an already extremely busy and crowded street. During the day, 122nd Ave is completely lined with parked cars on both sides of the street from 85th all the way to 80th. This is mainly because of employee cars of the businesses at the corner of 85th and 122nd (i.e. Weldon Barber, Dominos, Nail spas, Starbucks, etc.) who are not allowed to park in their own parking lot due to company policy (to allow room for customers to park), and so they are forced to park along 122nd Ave. Lake Washington HS students also park on 122nd Ave during the school months making the congestion on this street even worse. These two groups of cars have already caused issues for us with both the Post Office (parked cars routinely block our mailbox), as well as with Waste Management (our trash cans are also routinely blocked by vehicles). This has resulted in missed mail (our postman informed us he does not have to stop if our mail box is blocked) and missed trash services when the trash trucks cannot access our trash cans.

Having so many cars parked on 122nd on both sides of the street does not allow for two lanes of traffic to pass by one another in opposite directions in the center of 122nd, where as you know, there are no designated driving lanes. The center and side painted lanes quickly disappear South of 85th and North of 80th with no street lines in the middle. This routinely results in vehicles traveling on one side of the road having to pull over to allow vehicles traveling in the other direction to pass, before being able to continue on in their original direction. This has caused a major safety issue for us, as it is very difficult to see down 122nd Ave in either direction for oncoming traffic when pulling out of our driveway, as the field of view is often blocked by parked cars right up to our driveway. We've almost been in multiple accidents from cars speeding in excessive of the 25mph speed limit on 122nd Ave that we could not see due to parked cars blocking our view in both directions when exiting our driveway.

Speeding is an epidemic on 122nd Ave. The painted lettering on the street (25mph & dash marks) do little to slow down traffic on our street, something that speed bumps would do a better job controlling. We have a 15 month old daughter and our next door neighbor has a 17 month old son, and the uncontrolled speed of many people on 122nd Ave is extremely unnerving to both of our families and our neighbors as we walk our dogs and children to the nearby parks.
Rezoning the area North of the Kirkland Cemetery on 122nd Ave for commercial buildings and building height of 5-6 stories will only result in increased traffic, parking issues, and additional safety concerns for what we thought was a family friendly and safe residential neighborhood. We moved from the busy and overcrowded streets of Ballard in Seattle to South Rose hill for a safer and quieter residential community.

We would also ask that you add "areas South of 85th" to Policy RH 23.

Please consider our family and those of our neighbors, and don't rezone our residential street into a high density 5 story or higher mixed-use area.

Best,

Brendan & Courtney Mahoney
8054 122nd Ave NE, Kirkland 98033
(425) 765-2350
mahoneybs@gmail.com
Hello Ms. Brill,

I've seen notices from Susan Davis regarding the Jin request for rezoning for a mixed-use 5-story land use near our home. My husband and I live at 8720 126th Ave NE. I wanted to let you know that I am very happy that higher density housing is being added to Kirkland, as long as there is ample lower-income housing included in the projects. Housing costs are absurd. I understand that some of these projects must be in “my backyard.” For a society to truly be happy and work smoothly, we all need to make sacrifices. And frankly, I’m hopeful that bringing in a larger housing complex might bring some very beneficial things to my neighborhood such as fun restaurants, stores, services, more sidewalks, and better public transportation options while chasing out unwanted businesses such as the pawn shop and palm reader as well as derelict and abandoned buildings.

However, I think 5 stories is excessive for our neighborhood (blocking views and sunshine), and I’m concerned that ample infrastructure adjustments are not being included in the development plans such as new green spaces, pedestrian access paths, traffic mitigation plans, etc. Traffic on 85th is already awful. The traffic lights need to be smart to keep traffic flowing. Right now it is nearly always backed up so that we are unable get out from our own street and must go to the light at 128th to do so. I imagine having a large influx of new cars entering 85th here will be further compound the issue. The light rail is not coming to 85th. If it were, I wouldn't be as concerned.

In any case, I wanted to let you know we homeowners are not all opposed to these new developments. I just want to make sure many of them are low-income housing, and that concerns of current residents are addressed such as providing ample public green space, pedestrian access, and traffic and public transportation improvements.

Thanks for your time and consideration,
Camille and Jim Lamoureux

Consider donating to my fundraising ride in BikeMS supporting the National Multiple Sclerosis Society today!
Hello,

I am a South Rose Hill resident who has been hearing a great deal about proposed upzoning along 85th and, to a lesser degree, 70th (the Techcity Bowl/Bridle Trails shopping plot). While I do have concerns about traffic and school crowding, I support intelligent upzoning to allow more multi-resident housing in our city. The coming rapid bus station at 405 and 85th should grow into an asset that supports greater density, and 70th could accommodate a small increase in traffic (and perhaps Houghton Park and Ride could become useful again).

I would like to see more apartments since they tend to be inherently more affordable - regardless of The Affordable Housing Programs, a 500SF one bedroom will always be more likely to be affordable for a teacher just out of college than a stand alone house on a quarter acre of land (that a builder will bid up to a half-million just as a tear down). Kirkland has enough million dollar single family homes.

Regards,

John Weale
7526 126th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA, 98028
Hi Ms. Lieberman.

I have been a North Rose Hill resident for 50+ years and I fail to see how this project was zone changed, and will dominate the area in its massive size. I really think the city needs to understand that we are not against housing, we need housing, especially affordable housing. The plan and the builder will not have this affordable at all. And they will say that it will have 10% of the units as affordable but that means of the median income, which on the eastside, is $96,000 to $102,000. That is not affordable for a large majority of people searching for a home.

132nd Ave has become the alternate 405 freeway as has 124th Ave. Accessing and leaving this property will be a total nightmare for all. It does not fit into any reasonable neighborhood quality assurance.

I missed the startup of the neighborhood plan update, but will certainly try and be available for the rest of the public input. The city needs to pay attention to its residents and plan to enhance the quality rather than destroy it.

Regards,
Kathy Iverson
Hello Joan,

I hope that this note finds you well.

My wife Jennifer and I own the property and home at 8523 126th Ave NE Kirkland WA 98033. We have owned the property 2005. I am writing to express our support of the re-zone change to the land. We would like to see the property rezoned to Commercial or Mixed Use Limited Commercial/Multi Family or High Multifamily.

The property’s proximity to the existing commercial properties on 85th st (Ford Dealership and Mobile Gas Station) would seem to make it a natural for an up zone. Adding the ability to have more walkable retail options near North Rose Hill and/or more multifamily housing options for our growing community is something that I support.

A change in zoning would allow the land to be used in a different way to help provide options to accommodate the growth of our city.

Best regards,

Luke Lysen
206-334-0642
Objections to CONTINENTAL DIVIDE MIXED USE – DRV18-00312 and ROSE HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN DRAFT (7-17-18)
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COMMENTS ON THE CONTINENTAL DIVIDE MIXED USE - DRV18-00312 AND ROSE HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN DRAFT (7-17-18)

introduction
We recently became aware of these proposals that has significant impact on our home, located at 12861 NE 88th St, Kirkland, WA.

Issues
The North Rose Hill Street Connection Plan Map in the “ROSE HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN DRAFT (7-17-18)” lists connecting a number of streets to support the CONTINENTAL DIVIDE MIXED USE - DRV18-00312 project, which adds 133 high density units to a residential neighborhood. Note Page 16 of the plan draft. Of particular concern is the 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST connector.

Table NRH-1: North Rose Hill Street Connection Plan Description List
1. NE 108th ST between Slater Ave NE and 123rd Ave NE
2. Portions of NE 105th Pl between 129th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE
3. NE 103rd Pl between 132nd Ave NE and existing cul de sac end
4. NE 101ST P. between 131st Pl and 132nd Ave NE
5. 125TH Ave NE between NE 94th ST and NE 95th ST
6. 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST
7. NE 91ST ST between 130th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE
8. Portions of NE 90th ST between 128th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE

Staff Note: Staff will update the map and list to reflect completion status.
This development, with the significant traffic will add to an already over congested NE 85th Street and 132nd Ave would have a profound negative effect on the homeowners in the area, including Marie Fromm and Connie Eronson, homeowners of 12861 NE 88th St, Kirkland, WA. Our home is the yellow area indicated on the official King County GIS survey maps reproduced below.
The zoning maps list our home as zones RSX 7.2. Pursuing the Continental Divide project and the most recent street connection plan adding connection #6: 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST will burden the homeowners in the RSX 7.2 zoned area with enormous additional traffic attempting to bypass the severely congested 124th, 128th and 132nd Ave, which would produce idling exhaust fumes and increased danger to children and pedestrians on workday commute times and Sundays when the City Church draws hundreds of cars to the area. This is an unreasonable intrusion in a quiet neighborhood that today only services local traffic and has connecting trails used by pedestrians and bicycles.
In the most recent Kirkland Liquefaction / Mudslide potential maps (2018 City Initiated Comprehensive Plan Amendments, File Number CAM18-00363) the development of creating a connecting roadway at 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST will increase require removal of all major trees and increase the 30 degree grade of our property. Increasing steepness in a wetland drainage area dramatically increase the risk of a slide on our property. This action would effectively change our property designation from “moderate” landslide risk to “high” landslide risk. This will also increase the danger of a slide and damage to the home of our closest downhill neighbor, located at 12923 NE 88th St, as well as the other homeowners further down the hill. See https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/2018+City+Initiated+Comprehensive+Plan+Amendments+PC+08232018+Packet+WEB+%2B+CAM18-00363_Part3.pdf p45

The street drains for 87th Street NE drain out onto our property, to the south of our home, and our property was recently designated a critical wetland drainage area. Building the 130th Av NE connector would increase the grade and water draining onto our property and onto the home downhill, 12923 NE 88th St, leading to additional flooding and mudslide potential. Building a road on a wetland is contrary to Resolution 2017-2: Chapter 90 KZC Amendments (Critical Area Ordinance/Wetlands, Streams, Fish and Wildlife Conservation Areas, Minor Lakes and Frequently Flooded Areas) and related minor code amendments (CAM15-01832) https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Houghton+Community+Council/Chapter+90+HCC+Meeting+Packet+01262017+-+CAM15-01832.pdf
Kirkland’s Tree study report; “Internship Project Findings Related to Tree Code Efficacy, Kirkland Zoning Code Chapter 95, File Number CAM18-00408” https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/Tree+Research+Presentation+Staff+Report+with+Attachments+08092018+PC+Meeting+WEB.pdf finds that tree code loopholes are consistently being exploited, contrary to the stated goal of enhancing Kirkland’s urban forest to achieve an overall healthy, sustainable 40 percent tree canopy cover citywide over time. Much of the area surrounding our home to the North and South have been developed, and developers have exploited the current lax Kirkland tree canopy regulation and have eliminated almost all 100% major tree cover of the neighborhood in those developed areas. The developer to the South of our property “accidently” damaged then removed the major trees that were required to be retained on the developed property, and the developer subsequently replanted Arborvitae to meet replacement requirements but never watered them, letting them die. I have enclosed a picture adjacent to our property where the 130th Av NE connector would be built to connect 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST. Constructing this connector roadway would require removal of all of the major trees to the east of our home, the loss of which would eliminate wind buffer and lead to the loss of all of the major trees on our property. The construction of the roadway and loss of these trees and root systems would greatly increase soil erosion and mudslide potential on our property, and all the properties below us.
Solution

For these reasons we object to both the CONTINENTAL DIVIDE MIXED USE - DRV18-00312 project and the street connection plan supporting this project in the “ROSE HILL NEIGHBORHOOD PLAN DRAFT (7-17-18)” which details connector #6: 130TH Ave NE between NE 87th ST and NE 94th ST.

Signed: Marie Fromm and Connie Eronson 12861 NE 88th St, Kirkland, WA
From: Mary Yax [mailto:maryyax@cbbain.com]
Sent: Sunday, August 12, 2018 10:42 PM
To: City Council; Tony Leavitt; Eric Shields; Adam Weinstein
Subject: Continental Divide - Merit Homes

I would like to request that the City Council not approve any changes to the RH8 zoning for Rose Hill. As you know, Merit Homes is proposing a large mixed use project on NE 85th Street. It is a looming apartment building with only 7% commercial/office space. It is out of character, size, and design to the existing neighborhood. The other three corners of the same intersection will never have anything taller then a 2 story building. This project greatly effects our lives, our privacy, our traffic congestion. We are being imposed on enough. Merit Homes knows what the code was and is. We do not need a "builder friendly" code change. We need to see the City of Kirkland to stand up for its neighborhoods and the residents living in them.

The Planning Department has proposed a change in the code to allow residential units on the ground level. We would appreciate no change in zoning. We believe that Merit Homes should not be allowed to put residential units on the ground level as present code dictates.

We would appreciate less apartments and more office/commercial space. Please enforce the present codes on this project.

Mary Yax
206-612-8722
The Pointe, Rose Hill

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
I support increased height limits and mixed-use zoning at the Bridle Trails shopping center. This is because I like having businesses within walking distance, and we are more likely to retain them if there are more people in the neighborhood. I also believe that people of all incomes should have the opportunity to live in this neighborhood, near jobs and transit, and walking and biking distance to schools, churches and other daily needs. This is a neighborhood with transportation options, where one can live well with minimal driving.

I also support zoning for more housing within the 10-minute walkshed of the shopping center, particularly the apartment complexes nearby, and the single family zones across 70th.

Michelle Plesko
Bridle Trails
Hi Joan,

Our main questions are:

How can someone else ask to have our property considered for a rezone without our consent? The day we met our new neighbor Jin (8527 126th Ave. NE) a couple of weeks ago, he did speak with us about possibly rezoning the properties in the future, but we did not know that it had been submitted until we got a notice on our door from Susan Davis.

If the four properties were considered to be rezoned by the city, how does this affect our property taxes? If it is rezoned to commercial or high density residential will my property tax go up even if the property never gets developed? Most of the homes around us are rentals, so most of the owners probably don't have a vested interest in the neighborhood. We have owned this home for 22 years, and aren't looking to sell any time soon.

Please call my wife Vickie Elwell at her work tomorrow.
425-519-6522

Thank you,

Mike Elwell
8525 126th Ave. NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

On Thursday, August 2, 2018, 5:36:22 PM PDT, Joan Lieberman-Brill <JLiebermanBrill@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Mike and Vickie,

Thank you for both of your emails. I’ve been in meetings all day and will get back to you on Monday. Please provide your phone # and let me know when on Monday I can call. I’m here after 10 am. If you aren’t available I can instead email a response.

Sincerely,
This is regarding the first e-mail I sent.

The neighborhood notice I received on my door says Jin requested 4 properties for rezone.

A person named Jin purchased the home last November at 8527 126th Ave. NE... This is the only home he owns on the block. The Notice says Jin's request of 4 properties for rezone. 8519 (rental) owned by Fred Naslund, 8523 (rental) owned by Luke Lysen, 8525 owned by ME, and 8527 owned by Jin...

I wonder how Jin could request my property as a rezone without my consent?

Thank you for any information.

Michael and Vickie Elwell
8525 126th Ave. NE

Kirkland, WA 98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Please DoNot Rezone any property on NE 85th. From 405 east to 132nd. It will dramatically change my neighborhood for the worse.

Mike
Sent from my iPhone
Ms. Brill:

I am writing to register my disapproval for a rezoning request in my neighborhood. I own my home at 8211-122nd Ave NE next to the Kirkland Cemetery. Evidently Martin and Sharon Morgan have requested rezoning of their properties so that they will become mixed use, 5 story properties. I am very much opposed to this rezoning.

Kirkland is already compliant with the Growth Management with zoning as it is now, but it has already become almost impossible to peacefully live and drive in this neighborhood. **PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THINGS TO GET WORSE.** There have been several times I have had to sit at the end of 122nd Ave NE through multiple traffic lights because, with all the backed up cars, I couldn't pull out onto 85th. And several times I have had to remain at the light on 85th Street unable to turn onto 122nd because of the impossible Starbucks traffic. (Whoever approved the drive in location at that Starbucks should have their heads examined. The congestion drivers cause waiting to get into the Starbucks lot is continual and horrible!)

Those of us who live in this neighborhood already have to deal with so many cars parked on the street we can’t see to get out of our driveways, and our mailboxes are often blocked. As a self-employed person working out of my home, this is untenable. Add to that the insane number of road construction sites all over the area, leaving my house to go ANYWHERE has become a total nightmare. With hundreds, even thousands, of new residents, I can’t imagine what this area will be like.

Our current Neighborhood Comprehensive plan (Policy RH 23) says to maintain low-density detached residential housing as the primary land use north of 85th. **This should include areas south of 85th as well.**

My neighbors and I gather often and talk about what is happening to South Rose Hill. We feel ignored by the city of Kirkland in terms of anyone in city government caring about us as its citizens. Instead, we think the only thing Kirkland cares about is growing tax revenues. **The entire city government seems incredibly GREEDY to us and it’s hard to describe how disappointed we are in the people who are supposed to represent us and our interests.**

I have lived in Kirkland since 1982, but if things continue in this vein, I can guarantee you I won’t be living here much longer. Of course, the city probably won’t care - it will simply allow 10 people to replace me thus giving you even more revenue - but eventually this deterioration of the quality of life in Kirkland will haunt you all.

**Molly Murrah**
molly@mollymurrah.com
www.mollymurrah.com

When you change the way you look at things, the things you look at change.
–Max Planck
Hello Planning Staff,

I am a homeowner who lives at 8402 132nd Ave NE in Redmond, which is across 132nd Ave NE from Kirkland. Because I am across the street, the zoning plans of Kirkland affect my neighborhood and my family. Your commission is considering several projects that concern me.

Please note that according to Redmond, my home is zoned as R-4 Single-Family Urban Residential. According to their 2030 Zoning Plan, it will remain this zoning code through 2030. Definition of this zoning code here: http://online.encodeplus.com/regs/redmond-wa/doc-viewer.aspx?secid=1071#secid-1071


2. Applicant: City
The study area for this application is further south from the intersection of 132nd and 85th than my house. An office/retail building is directly across the street from my house. So if the single family homes in this study area become businesses or high density apartment buildings, my home will be much more isolated from the neighborhood. The Kirkland side of the street would become very unlike the single family homes that surround our property on the Redmond side. Also, the homes on the east end of the study area were built in 2014, which seems like an extremely short time to have allowed homes to be built just to rezone them. Areas with much older homes that are in poor condition seem like better candidates for rezoning.

I suggest:

- Zoning option A (No Change - Retain Low Density RS 7.2).

9. Applicant: Bridle Trails Shopping Center
The current strip mall is appropriate and convenient for the neighborhood. The applicant wants 65 feet of height in a neighborhood where nothing for a mile (and perhaps miles) is that tall. The subject property, The Bridle Trails Shopping Center, has recently had new renovations such as the Dairy Queen changed to a Chase Bank and the Red Apple Market changed to a Grocery Outlet. It seems unfair and inappropriate to allow these businesses to invest months of renovation just to rezone and demolish the structures. The Redmond 2030 Zoning Map (link above) shows the mixed use building on the northeast corner of 70th and 132nd is not going to be rezoned. It is 3 stories with the first floor being retail, the second being apartments, and only on the...
west side the 3rd floor is apartments. The scale of the building is surrounded by parking spaces and a pedestrian-friendly bridge at the corner. Bridle Trails Apartments (to the west) is made up of 2-story separated buildings. Across 132nd is an undeveloped park, single family residences, and streets to winding cul-de-sacs. Redmond doesn't plan to match the scale of this project and it will be completely inappropriate now and well into the future.

I suggest:

- No flexibility for residences on the ground floor. It is to the benefit of apartment residents and businesses not to be mingled on the first floor.
- No rooftop open space amenities because they are detrimental to neighborhood noise levels.
- Allow flexibility in parking standards as long as exceptions are not based on fantasies of the majority of people riding bikes, using public transit, and walking in the future.
- A height of 2 stories would be an appropriate maximum based on the neighboring apartment buildings.

Sincerely,
Olivia Ahna
8402 132nd Ave NE
Hi Joan,

I’ve been out of town and came home to see a notice from some neighbors that Kirkland is looking to rezone some of Rose Hill. I own 2 homes on NE 84th that it appears would be affected by this proposal. I’m curious if you can share with me what the “plan” or proposals being considered would be. There is rumor that part of this would include connecting NE 84th St from 128th Ave to 132nd Ave. My wife and I would object greatly to this as living on a dead end street is the reason we’ve bought the homes we own. Our hope is to retire soon and move from our 2 story home to the rambler we bought next door.

I’m not sure what the timing is for meetings, disclosures, decision making but I’d appreciate being kept in the loop on how follow or participate in any future decisions about our street and the area around us.

Any information you can share with me or input on websites where more information can be seen would be appreciated.

Paul Isenburg
206-948-5885
Dear Kirkland City Council Members, Planning Commission, and Design Review Board,

My family lives in the house at 12924 Ne 87th St, Kirkland, WA 98033, which is near the subject property for the Continental Divide Mixed Use project. I have serious concerns about the process that led to this project and I request your help in mitigating the detrimental effects of this project before it is built. This same process is happening again as the Planning Commission is making the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for our neighborhood (Rose Hill/Bridle Trails) and hopes to wrap it up by the end of 2018. I believe the notification process does not reach enough people and the methods of publicizing the plan are unfair and insufficient. Please review the notification standards the Planning Commission must use to notify the public.

Currently the City of Kirkland does the following to notify the community about rezone proposals:

- Posting notice on public notice sign boards surrounding the rezone property, on all adjacent streets
- Posting notice on the City’s website
- Publishing notice in the Seattle Times
- Posting notice on official notification boards at City Hall

Please consider adding the following:

- On plan maps, especially those shown to the public, change the misleading term "office" in the legend to better reflect the code description. I suggest mixed-use, mixed-use high-density residential, or commercial high-density residential.

- Notify the community sooner and multiple times to make sure new residents are notified. I suggest every 6 months.

- Notify by mail. Small signs posted at busy intersections are insufficient.
• Notify a larger radius around proposed rezoning areas. Redmond and Bellevue send notifications to a 500 ft radius, while Kirkland sends to just a 300 ft radius.

• Add a public notice sign to each lot on which a building will be developed. One sign in front of three lots makes it seem as if only one will be developed.

Specifically about the Continental Divide Project, I have concerns about the severe change this project could mean to our neighborhood. The developer has a building permit but the design has not been approved. Please do all that is within the Kirkland City Council’s power to address my concerns before the Design Review Board approves the design on September 17th.

Violations of zoning codes and the Comprehensive Plan:

• The description of the project states it is “a four story mixed use building” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan limits buildings to three stories by stating, “providing incentives including increased building heights up to three stories” (Policy NE85-4.8). This project cannot have four stories if the limit is three stories. If there is a conflict between zoning codes the most restrictive of these apply (KZC 170.50).

• This project includes residential units on the ground floor, but the Zone Use Chart for the zone where this project is located (RH-8) states that stacked dwelling units “may not be located on the ground floor of a structure” (KZC 53.84 Zone RH8 Use Zone Chart .050 Stacked Dwelling Units). This violation should not be ignored and no exceptions should be granted.

• The description of the project states, “A single story commercial building will be located near NE 85th Street” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan prohibits such buildings by stating, “Discourage single story retail buildings” (Policy NE85-4.8).

Notice to the community: I believe the notice given by the City of Kirkland was insufficient. Kirkland notifies too late in the process and notifies fewer neighbors than other nearby cities. Maps and notices use the misleading term "Office" for businesses and/or high-density apartments. In very late June 2018, a public notice sign went up at the corner of 85th/Redmond Way and 132nd Ave NE and we received a notice about a July 2nd Design Review Meeting. This was the very first time I heard about this project. There were no other notices sent since December 2015 (two-and-a-half years). The notices sent in December 2015 were from an old list that wasn’t updated to include homeowners who bought homes directly adjacent to the project in the previous six months. Even still, none of longtime homeowners who lived within 300 feet of this project knew about the changes that would so severely impact their properties. Please consider overhauling the entire process for notifying the community about zoning, public comment periods, and public meetings.

Jarring transition between houses and huge complex: If this project is approved as-is a towering wall of over 200 windows and balconies will overlook single-family homes, leaving some homes in shadow all winter. This horseshoe-shaped project has adjoining walls between residential units and commercial spaces. These both violate the city’s land use policy to “create effective transitions between commercial areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods” (Policy LU-5.1 Urban Design).
Safety: Bicyclists, joggers, and walkers could be endangered by the busy garage entrances. One of these garage entrances is next to a school bus stop and along schoolchildren's walking routes. Current neighbors on dead-end 131st and along 132nd already have trouble accessing their homes and this project adds busy driveways to both streets. The nearby megachurch traffic already requires a police officer to direct Sunday traffic at the intersection for this project.

Less parking than required: The developer claims their parking spaces will be used by businesses during the day and as guest parking at night, however dual use parking spaces not allowed by code. Surrounding streets have almost no street parking and new fire hydrants required because of this project mean even less parking. More parked cars on narrow 131st means less emergency access.

Family atmosphere: I am concerned about the family-oriented neighborhood we have now changing into big apartment complexes with studio apartments. New residents in this project will find themselves in an area with minimal bus service, very few businesses catering to them, and a steep hill bordered by forested ravines. The pedestrians in our neighborhood tend to be neighbors walking their dogs, retirees on a walk, commuters taking the bus to Redmond, and children going to and from school. I'm concerned that the young people attracted to this complex are not going to find the convenient amenities they want and 134 units of new people will change the character of our residential area.

Garbage collection: The dumpster for entire building is collected next to a neighbor's one-story home. When the garbage truck backs up into the driveway for collection, it will block access to one of only two entrances for the whole apartment complex. That seems inconvenient and even dangerous for that many people to be down to one entrance.

No moving truck loading zone: Studio apartments are for young people whose lives are ever-changing. This project has no loading zone for a moving truck. Just as with garbage collection, if a moving truck blocks either driveway, residents are down to one way in or out. If moving trucks choose to stop on 132nd, they will be impacting an already clogged intersection. If the moving truck parks on 131st, it will impact a dead-end street already overwhelmed by nearby businesses using their street to park.

No play area or open spaces for children: Children who live in this apartment complex will have no options for playing outside. The nearest public park is a 13-minute 0.7 mile walk almost entirely along busy 85th Street. The current proposal for this apartment complex doesn't include any playground equipment or even an open grassy area for children. The center courtyard will be a parking lot, which cannot be safe a play area.

Businesses that the community will frequent: With just 7% of the square footage for businesses, this project can just barely be considered mixed use. The developer’s plan is to use the retail space for their own corporate
Quality of life: Only because of neighborhood outcry, the city wrote an FAQ document about this project. In response to our concerns about our quality of life, the city replied, “The City does not have a metric for quality of life.” The developer has no incentive to preserve our quality of life and the city says there is no metric for it. My neighbors and I are on the cusp of losing the quality of life in our neighborhood. It will come in the form of towering walls of windows, noisy apartments, busy driveways choking gridlocked intersections, loss of solar access all winter, children with nowhere to play, moving trucks and garbage trucks blocking roads, and so many people crammed into a once-quiet neighborhood. All of this on streets lined with modest houses and homeowners who were not given the chance to prevent it.

I am seeking the following solutions and intervention on the City Council’s part:

- This development should not be granted a permit. The development needs to decrease the size to three stories and replace residential units with retail on the ground floor, per the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan.

- The upcoming Design Review Board meeting on September 17th should be cancelled, because the developer has not complied with zoning code and the Design Review Board should not approve a design that violates zoning code.

- Please re-examine the unlimited density in the RH-8 zone abutting residential. Adjust it to reflect the neighborhood plan and land use goals that are part of the comprehensive plan.

- In December 2015, the developer used a Citizen Amendment Request to change 6 parcels that were zoned residential to "Office." This is a misleading term because it did not communicate the possibility of high-density residential units next to single family homes. The zoning code description should reflect the term “office” or terms like “High-density Residential” and “Mixed Use” should be used so the community is not misled again.

- Please completely overhaul and modernize the notification process. The current process relies on community members being highly involved in local government through reading newspapers, reading city newsletters, visiting city websites, subscribing to city update email lists, and even physically visiting city hall to read notice boards.

Please do not set a precedent by allowing this huge, out-of-place development in our neighborhood that clearly conflicts with Kirkland’s zoning codes and Comprehensive Plan. Please do what is in the power of the Kirkland City Council to help our neighborhood keep its current family atmosphere, the traffic flow of those passing through, the safety of our children, and our quality of life. We are counting on you to hear us and make the vital changes necessary before the Continental Divide project is built.

Sincerely,

Roger Wright
Dear Ms. Brill,

I am writing to you in your capacity as the planner for Rose Hill. It has come to my attention that an application for a rezoning by Martin and Sharon Morgan, involving 122nd Ave NE, as part of a larger effort impacting areas north of the NE 85th commercial area and east of 120th Ave NE. As you know, current zoning calls for low density detached residential housing as the primary land use in this area. The city is currently compliant with the Growth Management act through 2035. The application apparently requests rezoning to allow increased density including building heights of up to 5-6 stories in this area.

My residence is located at 8050 122nd Ave NE, directly across from the Kirkland Cemetery. I have lived here since May of 2014. Since I moved in, I have seen constantly increasing traffic along 122nd Ave NE, with a distressing frequency of significant speeding, as drivers consistently try to avoid traffic on NE 85th. Despite posted speed limit signs, drivers tear up and down the street. Complicating the situation is that employees of the businesses of the commercial strip mall on NE 85th regularly park on both sides of 122nd Ave NE. During the school year, students from Lake Washington High School also park on 122nd Ave NE. The street is not wide enough to accommodate parking on both sides and two lanes of traffic. Thus, it frequently feels like my neighborhood street is the site of continual games of "chicken" to see who is going to have to stop and pull into a drive way or squeeze over to allow the opposing traffic to pass. The icing on the cake comes when cars entering and exiting Starbucks and the commercial mall fronting NE 85th OFTEN block the intersection of 122nd Ave NE and NE 85th. This ends up irritating drivers, resulting in reckless and dangerous actions.

In addition, the parking up and down 122nd Ave NE often comes right up to the edge of my driveway. This significantly decreases visibility in trying to exit my driveway, sometimes pulling out onto the street is met with having to avoid a speeding car going up or down the street,...and frequently a less than cordial sign from the speeding drivers because they had to slow a bit to avoid hitting me. In addition, those parking on the street often block the mailboxes and the garbage cans...."I'm sure you are aware that neither the postal workers nor waste management people need to service my residence if they can't easily access mailboxes or garbage cans. I have had more than one instance when my garbage cans were not emptied.

I am an avid walker, and regularly take my dog out for walks. It is getting harder and harder to walk without having to dodge aggressive drivers. My once-quiet neighborhood is becoming far from walker-friendly. As well, there are several families with small children living on 122nd Ave NE. Pets have been hit and killed. Needless to say, that is tragedy enough.

Rezoning to allow higher density development as has been requested would aggravate traffic and safety concerns, and parking-related problems significantly. I therefore respectfully request current zoning be maintained, and that current residents be clearly supported by Kirkland planning efforts. As well, I would like to see that areas South of NE 85th be added to Policy RH23. Lastly, I would like to request notification when this issue is to be addressed by the planning commission and city council.

Thank you for your consideration.

Sarah J. Sanford
8050 122nd Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Hi Adam and Joan,

"Rezone to office RH 8 zone. (KZC Chapter 53) RH8 zone uses allowed with Design Review: office, school, and daycare, size limited retail, restaurants, entertainment, cultural, recreation, banks, multifamily. *Maximum building height is 30’, with parcels consolidated to 18,000 sq. ft. allowed 35’ with conditions."

I think this sentence needs to be addressed, it is not capturing the "unlimited density" which is not stated, as well as other concerns, plus the RH8 neighborhood plan and the zoning code and land use really needs to be looked at.

https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Land+Use+Study+Areas.pdf

Susan

Susan Davis spicker76@yahoo.com Have a GREAT day! : )
This Jin request did not have the consent of a property owner. That does not seem right. And all of the other property owners who have no clue for the city initiated rezones unless they dig for the info or care to go to the boring and rather developer focused meetings. Our city policy needs to change on this. TAX PAYING and Voting RESIDENTS are getting the short end of the stick. Why be involved in a comprehensive plan and spend the time when the city is constantly making exceptions in the name of affordable housing. What about the people who do not qualify for affordable housing (missing middle, we need more triplexes, or townhomes), or low income people on a 3 yr wait list for this mystical affordable housing. And what about the homeless? If anything the county should purchase already built older apartments on a good transit route, and turn them into affordable housing, The city should require 20% affordable for 25 yrs (instead of 10% for 50 yrs) so the area gets over the growth pains. For the homeless get more temporary housing, use a public Building at night when it is not being used. Get the Salt house family center built ASAP, expedite all of the required city permits! Encourage more churches to house the homeless, give Marys Place and Sophias Way more money that the city is spending on the CKC or the tax money paid by developers. The city should tell King County don't spend $190 million of the tourist tax to remodel Safeco Field. Spend only $50 m and use the rest to purchase apartments and make them 100% affordable. There are many larger more effective ways to create affordable housing. Then a huge apartment right next to residential with 13 affordable units has such a small positive impact for affordable housing and a big negative impact on the neighborhood. I would be happy and supportive of rezones if the city/County stepped up and purchased apartments with our tax dollars or/and built a large apartment with our tax dollars with bonds or increased sales tax that were 100% affordable. Susan

On Aug 6, 2018 4:55 PM, Joan Lieberman-Brill <JLiebermanBrill@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

We are reviewing all the requests, it’s likely that some won’t be pursued, and we’ll notify property owners and surrounding residents well in advance of the City Council decision on any rezoning’s.

Sincerely,

---

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Joan, how could this happen? I would think Jin should have to sign a legal affidavit and get all the property owner's to sign one as well to prove that the owner home that is listed does indeed want the rezone. Another policy to add.

On Aug 6, 2018 3:17 PM, Kaylie Duffy <KDuffy@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

Joan (cc'd) can provide you with more information regarding the potential rezone request you are referencing.

Have a nice day!

-Kaylie
The person contacted Joan.

I think in general the planning dept needs to contact all parcels in the possible rezone study areas ASAP. It is not fair and you will get a lot of push back I think that is why the planning dept and city council are deciding not to notify the affected parcels now instead of 2 weeks before a public hearing.

On Aug 6, 2018 2:33 PM, Kaylie Duffy <KDuffy@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

Which properties are you referencing? Once I know which parcels you're talking about, I can pass on your feedback to the appropriate senior planner.

Thanks for voicing your concerns.

Best,
Kaylie

From: Susan Davis [mailto:susandavis@live.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 2:25 PM
To: Kaylie Duffy
Subject: RE: rezone study of my property by city and not notified?

I think they should notify as soon as they have the planning dept do a study. It doesn't make sense and many property owners do not want a rezone. The city should send a letter asap. They are wasting everybody's time esp if all of the owners in a city initiates rezone study say no. Also the JIN request is it considered a CAR? He did not get all 4 property owners permission and the other 7 extended study parcels should be contacted ASAP.

On Aug 6, 2018 2:14 PM, Kaylie Duffy <KDuffy@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

Yes, the City would have to notify the property owner if the City initiates a rezone.
Best,
Kaylie

From: Susan Davis [mailto:susandavis@live.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 2:01 PM
To: Kaylie Duffy
Subject: RE: rezone study of my property by city and not notified?

Does the city have to notify the property owner if the city initiates a rezone. I would think as soon ad a rezone is initiated by the city they should send letters that same week not wait u til 2 weeks before public hearing.

On Aug 6, 2018 1:37 PM, Kaylie Duffy <KDuffy@kirklandwa.gov> wrote:

Hi Susan,

Good afternoon! The City of Kirkland is required to provide notice for rezone proposals at least 14 days prior to the public hearing in these ways: Posting notice on public notice sign boards surrounding the rezone property, on all adjacent streets; Posting notice on the City’s website; Publishing notice in the Seattle Times; Posting notice on official notification boards at City Hall.

As a courtesy, Kirkland also sends notice at least 14 days prior to the public hearing to all Kirkland residents/tenants and property owners for properties both in and outside Kirkland’s jurisdiction, that are within 300 feet of the property to be rezoned. Notice is also sent to all interested parties that have requested notice or submitted comments. In addition, the City typically conducts other outreach for zoning efforts that extends well beyond mandatory requirements. Other outreach includes attendance at neighborhood association meetings, community workshops, and community events; email and paper newsletters; and surveys.

In the case of a Citizen Amendment Request for a specific site where the property owner is not making the request, the applicant must notify the property owner in writing of the request. You can learn more about the process here.

Please let me know if you need any additional information.
Sincerely,

Kaylie Duffy | Assistant Planner
Planning & Building Department
City of Kirkland
p: 425.587.3228

From: Susan Davis [mailto:SusanDavis@live.com]
Sent: Monday, August 06, 2018 10:44 AM
To: PlanningInfo
Subject: rezone study of my property by city and not notified?

HI Does the city rezone property without notifying the land owner (residential) before they start a study on should this property be rezoned either city initiated or a neighbor (who did not get my permission) then they include my property without my knowledge? Please let me know

Susan

Sent from Mail for Windows 10

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello Planning Commission, City Council, Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods, Kurt, David, Adam and Joan,

I attended the planning commission mtg last night. I would like to comment further on these projects since we did not have a public comment after the city presented the rezone requests. I understand that citizens need to get involved in order to comment on a neighborhood plan. I was at the mtg and will be at future meetings! I now understand the impact that these decisions make on our community and I will make the time to educate others on these changes. I believe that it was a developer focused meeting last night because of all of the requested rezones and because the developers showed up!

I keep hearing about affordable housing. We require 10% but it is never mentioned the developer gets 2 bonus units for every affordable unit. This is definitely a win for the developer. Redmond and Bellevue only give one bonus unit. I think it should only be one unit. What is the background on 2 bonus units?

As you know from my comments last night I want more involvement from the residents. I am sure the city would also like more involvement and I think we can get more involvement if the city changed their policies relating to giving public notice. We can use the best practices of other nearby cities. Give the residents a required (not courtesy) notice of a rezone, major project within 500 ft of all the parcels that might be rezoned. Please change from 15 days to 21 or even 30 days ahead of time to send the letter and post the boards. Explain in the letter/flyer the current zoning vs. proposed zoning. People can see the details like 7.2 vs RH8 matrix (see attached file) - which was made by the planning dept for the city council to summarize the changes. Can we please add this matrix to the notice? "Too office" really does not describe what it happening. It is very difficult to understand zoning changes. I would like to see how we can work with the city council to make these changes. I have been told the city council would have to make code changes.

City Council and Kurt,
I need to understand the most recent GMA plan for the housing created by neighborhood and how many housing units we told the state we would create over the next 10 or more years. I cannot find this information anywhere. I only found out dated information. Do we really need these proposed rezones for the GMA? I think we need to slow down making so many zoning changes especially since we have limited bus transportation options until 2024, and our roads are already very
crowded. The 85th corridor just underwent renovations and still does not properly handle all of the traffic. We will have more issues once it take 2 or more years to re-do the 85th /405 interchange.

My feedback on the Comprehensive plan changes.
Even though it specifically states in our neighborhood plan the following. Why do we have these policies when we do not follow them?

Policy RH 23: **Maintain low - density detached residential housing** as the primary land use in the areas north of the NE 85th Street commercial area, east of 124th Avenue NE, south of the commercial area and east of 120th Avenue NE.

Policy RH 24: Encourage the efficient use of larger lots north and south of the NE 85 th ST corridor at the maximum densities allowed by the underlying zoning.

Thank you for encouraging other forms of tiny homes so people can have more flexibility with adding housing in an established neighborhood. I think the city needs to encourage more residential suites (like Arete) in these proposed high density projects.

The six rezones that I have concerns. - link to the summary info
https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/North_South+Rose+Hill+-+Bridle+Trails+Neighborhood+Plan+Update+PC+Meeting+Packet+7_26_18+-+CAM18-00082+WEB_Part2.pdf

1. JIN Request: Rezone 11 7.2 SF homes to mixed use commercial/ multifamily or higher density residential. **This does not match our policies for this area. The intersection at 126/85 does not support a high density land use. I do not think any of these parcels should be rezoned.**

2. Applicant: City
Requests: Increase density and/or commercial capacity on existing larger underdeveloped sites within Rose Hill Business District commercial corridor or expand boundaries of District. Study Area: South perimeter of East End (128th to 132nd) - behind RH8, east of RM 3.6 zone, and north of NE 84th St

**I do not support this rezone. There are enough high density housing projects in the pipeline near 85th/405 and we need to maintain residential zoning. I would be open to allowing more density for residential homes like the project directly south of 128/132 (behins First Tech Credit Union) which created residential homes at a higher density. Or adding town homes. I think the opportunity for home ownership should be increased.**

3. Madison Development request for RH 3 code amendments. Now they have proposed at 740 apartments they want 100% lot coverage instead of 80%, less required parking and almost 10 extra ft for building height. **It should stay at 80%, the applicant knew the zoning and they should work with what they have. This area is different from Totem Lake development with look, feel, location and we should not have changes to this zoning. The parking requirement being lowered seems reasonable. If they add 100 residential suites to their 740 apartment mix I would be open to a higher lot coverage.**

4. Applicant: City
Request: Consider increased density and intensity of land uses within the existing RHBD Regional Center zones closest to the future Sound Transit Station at NE 85th/I-405 interchange and Bus Rapid Transit along NE 85th St. **I do not support this. I need more information on the city's GMA plan and how we are meeting density increases in the whole city.**
5. Applicant: Martin and Sharon Morgan
Request: Rezone four parcels owned by applicant to commercial zone or higher residential density. I only support the 4 lots being rezoned. This area also has many fairly new SF homes and I do not support expanding the rezone past these 4 lots.

6. Lee Johnson rezone. I do not support this rezone.

We need to deal with the current high density parcels that are already zoned to see if the 85th corridor is a viable area for huge developments. I think the city council is convinced that people will take the BRT at 85th, and traffic will not be added to 85th. This bus is only going to come more frequently, the Seattle commute will still be long on the bus. It will be a 2 plus seat ride to downtown Seattle as all of the buses will get kicked out of the tunnel within the year. Buses from Kirkland will have to stop at the UW rail station and riders will transfer to the rail. I ride the bus to Pioneer Square Seattle for work. The bus gets stuck in traffic like all of the single occupancy vehicles. Now a BRT on 405 will be merging onto 520 from the far left lane of 405 with no HOV lanes to get onto 520. Then the bus usually goes slow over 520 as traffic gets backed up. There is not an HOV exit off of 520 to the UW rail station that I am aware of so this bus will be sitting in traffic with the single occupancy vehicles to get the riders to their second seat on the rail.

Could I please get my questions answered?

Thank you for your time.
Susan

Susan Davis spicker76@yahoo.com Have a GREAT day! : )
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Max Density</th>
<th>RSX 7.2 (Study Area and to north)</th>
<th>RH 8 (to south and west)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Single family, 7,200 s.f. min. lot size (6 units/acre)</td>
<td>Unlimited density, stacked units above the ground floor</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Setbacks front/side/rear</td>
<td>20'/5' min, 15' total/10'</td>
<td>10' adjacent to NE 85th St., otherwise 20'/0'/15'</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lot Coverage</td>
<td>50%</td>
<td>70%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Affordable Housing Required?</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>No</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Height</td>
<td>30 feet above average building elevation (ABE)</td>
<td>30 feet above ABE*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Design Review</td>
<td>No</td>
<td>Yes, ADR**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>NRH Plan &amp; NE 85th St. Subarea Plan Policy Direction</td>
<td>North Rose Hill Plan</td>
<td>North Rose Hill Plan</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Goal NRH 8 - Promote and retain the residential character of the NRH neighborhood in order to prevent commercial encroachment.</td>
<td>Policy NRH 8.2 - Locate new commercial development in the business districts at the north and south boundaries of the NRH neighborhood in order to prevent commercial encroachment.</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hi Planning Commission and Joan,

I would like a copy of the draft plan known as attachment 1 included in the part 1 of the July 26 mtg with the marked up version showing the changes that the planning department has made on the policies.

I believe that the below policies should NOT be changed. except that "south of 85th all the way to 132 Ave NE" needs to be included in Rh 23 policy as the area is also mainly low density established residential and should not be rezoned into a high density mixed use.

"Policy RH 23: Maintain low- density detached residential housing as the primary land use in the areas north of the NE 85th Street commercial area, east of 124th Avenue NE, south of the commercial area and east of 120th Avenue NE."

"Policy RH 24: Encourage the efficient use of larger lots north and south of the NE 85 th ST corridor at the maximum densities allowed by the underlying zoning."

"Policy RH 42: On the north and south boundaries of the Rose Hill District, allow multifamily residential uses at a density of 12 units per acre. Allow a greater density if affordable housing is a component of the development."

I also believe "Commercial development should not be permitted to spread beyond the existing NE 85th Street commercial area into adjacent residential areas" on page 9 should not be changed.

I think drive-through windows need to be limited in the Rh 7 and 8 areas and not removed from the plan. The height needs to stay at 30 ft and not go to 35 ft. listed on page 6 and 7 on the draft. The commercial/mixed use buildings will be next to residential that can only go to 30 ft and most existing homes are much shorter than 30 ft. And if they qualify for the affordable housing incentive they will get another 5 ft (?) so they will now be 40 ft tall if the plan is changed and towering over a residential area.

Additionally at the July 26 planning commission mtg the packet also included a file that was edited by Rodney Rutherford and Martin Morgan. How are there comments getting or not getting incorporated. It appears that Rodney and Martin want to rezone and over develop the area south of 85th and east of 124 the AVE where they own residential homes (conflict of interest?). I do not believe their comments should replace our existing neighborhood plans for the Rh23 and RH 24 as well as a few other revisions they recommend. They are not professionals and they have a financial
interest in the area they are trying to change to more commercial development by rezoning the residential area they live in.

Thank you in advance for considering my input.
Susan

Susan Davis spicker76@yahoo.com Have a GREAT day! : )
Hi Ms Lieberman,

There are lots of families with small kids in our neighborhood (60th and 116th ave ne) There is no playground where kids can play during school hours. There is nothing that brings our community together. If you have small kids (and no car), there are hardly anything to walk to in this area or sidewalks as well. The Bridal Trails is great for equestrians but there is nothing there for the kids. As a community with small kids, we would rather see a playground in our neighborhood instead of transfer station. The transfer station is making our roads unsafe. Trucks coming out of the station do not always watch for pedestrians. The community is in the process of collecting signature in this regards.

Thank you for your attention in this regards

Regards,
Tolga
From: Virginia Kaiser  
To: James Coogan  
City of Kirkland  
Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan - 7-24-18  
I would like the City to consider rezoning my property to medium density  
3 M 3.6  
The eleven townhouses next to me are what people want. They prefer what  
not to live in apartments, they also  
don't want small yards and not spending  
their weekend doing yardwork.  
124th Ave has a great park, sidewalks, Safeway, Walgreens and other  
stores. It is also on a bus route  
and near the entrance of 405. Also  
walking distance to Rose Hill grade  
school and Lake Washington High School.  
Virginia Kaiser  
8239 124th Ave. NE  
Kirkland, WA - 98033-8018  
ph: 425-822-3278  
ID No: 122336038609  

Sorry I do not have Email
Hello Kirkland City Planners,

I have come to my attention, through information and action gathered by my immediate neighbors of the community bounded by 132nd Ave NE, NE 88th Street, NE 90th Street that you are planning to, or discussing following through with a plan, to connect 130th Ave NE, NE 88th Street and NE 90th to the main thoroughfare of 132nd and connect 128th Ave NE – creating a main thoroughfare there as well. I have to oppose this suggested plan as it greatly affects the peaceful enjoyment of my neighborhood and will dramatically decrease the safety of the children and animals that use this neighborhood to walk through, as an option to stay off of the busy 132nd Ave NE thoroughfare.

As I see it, a more sound and proven method of accommodating additional traffic volumes while maintaining flow and reducing congestion is by converting existing, over-busy stop lights into roundabouts at state highway 908. The lights at 132rd & 85th, 128th and 85th and 124th and 85th would better served by the conversion to roundabouts. Those would leverage existing streets, with sidewalks and two way traffic, without requiring taking possession of private lands and building new road throughways. The cost savings of conversion at existing main intersections, rather than creating entirely new road infrastructure seems like a very solid reason to truly explore this possibility. I would hate to have my neighborhood overrun with traffic, have our limited street parking taken away and have my tax dollars going to buying up and developing private lands that currently protect our environment from noise and traffic pollution, in addition to providing us with safe, walkable areas in our increasingly crowded city area.

I know I speak on the behalf of all of my family and neighbors when I say none of us want our quiet subdivision to become a main thoroughfare area for commuters avoiding traffic on 132nd and highway 908. We all purchased homes here knowing it is situated in a dead end neighborhood and it's a big reason for our choice to buy here. While I am in support of measured growth with safe accommodation to ease growing pains, I don't feel that our neighborhood should be required to bear the brunt of the impacts from the new apartment development especially when we have existing roads already built that can be used more wisely.

Sincerely,

Yvonne Markgraf Stoehr
(206)250-4254 tel
To whom it may concern,

I am writing to express my SUPER SUPER concern about the city request on page 3 of the following doc. I am currently a resident in this rezone area (13108 NE 84th ST).

I purchased this house in 2018 April as I love it's a dead end street with peaceful environment. We have been fighting with the new Merit project in 85th & 132nd. Now we have to face another rezone challenge. I wonder what's the motivation of the government to do this as no developer has submitted this request. I am STRONGLY opposed to this proposal and request you to reach out to residents in this area asking for their comments. I'm pretty sure NO ONE would say yes to this awful rezone request. Please loop me in the future meetings on this rezone request. I'm super worried that Kirkland will become another Seattle in the near future...

https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/North_South+Rose+Hill+-+Bridle+Trails+Neighborhood+Plan+Update+PC+Meeting+Packet+7_26_18+-+CAM18-00082+WEB_Part2.pdf

Thanks,
Lingjun
Hi Joan,

I understand you are the contact person for the city regarding the attempt to rezone a number of properties in Bridle Trails that border 65th St. Pam and I are the owners of 6424 126th Ave NE and we would like to express our desire that the properties not be rezoned. We purchased the property a few years back after living in the neighborhood for 13 years and the main attractiveness to us was the horse property zoning and the fact that there would be no increase in density. I am not sure why our house/lot is included in this request as we have no desire to see the zoning changed and would like to see the neighboring lots remain the same as well. I would also like to point out that there is an error in the email sent by Dan Weise that states access to all of the properties is from the NE 70th street. Our house is not accessible from NE 70th St other than our barn. Our front door and garage can only be accessed off of NE 60th St. Please let us know how we can engage in this process and what the status and timing is for a decision.

Thanks

Dan Hay
425-822-8285 (home)
206-660-4664 (cell)
Spruce Villas HOA and other homeowners of 118th are adamantly opposed to the request of Lee Johnston Chevrolet request to increase his property height to 75' across his whole property and to his even more damaging (and massively unaligned with any Kirkland community vision statements) request to be allowed to build a 160’. The latter may simply be an absurd request to make his 75’ request seem like a reasonable compromise but it is unnecessary and Tod Johnston’s recent deceptive communication with our homeowners have highlighted he knows this is bad for everyone but them, a Lee Johnston opportunistic cash grab to be paid for by all North & South Rose Hill homeowners.

Having learned of the massive increase in units (and resulting cars) late last week and gotten additional specifics on Tuesday night, we are still scrambling to understand the impact and all the requests being made to Kirkland. As such the concerns and technical detail I’ve included here are notably incomplete at the moment. We also have not yet been able to make all the surrounding communities aware of the massive requests but all that we have reached including all homeowners on 118th and our neighboring association on 80th are opposed to both Lee Johnston’s requests. To the rest of the proposals, they are working to understand the rest and what the impact as whole could mean. Given the vehement feedback so far, we will likely be adding all the surrounding homeowners in the next week or two once we have made them aware of Lee Johnston’s two rezoning requests.

Our initial concerns about Lee Johnston’s proposal are:
- The 1200 (and especially the 2400) unit proposal it would massively increase already often gridlocked traffic on 85th and all the adjoining roads, especially 70th, 80th, 116th and 120th. This is in addition to the thousands of other units being considered along and around 85th and in addition to all the additional traffic going to the new units going into downtown Kirkland. Nowhere in any of the proposals are there any specifics for how roads would be expanded or other solutions would be provided for that many additional commuters, the vast majority of which would have cars and use them. Additional risk on 80th and 120th given the school zones and this increase in unconcerned, likely frustrated drivers trying to bypass 85th.

- They would also unquestionably push to use 118th as a main entrance and exit as 85th and 120th entrances they have now would be woefully inadequate. Our cul-de-sac that has been a boon to the families that have been and are currently being raised here would be much more dangerous and clogged with cars coming and going and trying to via for the few street parking places.
- His proposal would literally blot out the sun for Spruce Villas and our neighbor. Where our view is now trees (that were planted to block the view into the car lot) and sky, we would have a wall of people looking into our homes.

- As the Kirkland police chief highlighted in Tuesday’s meeting, more people means more crime and this would mean an incredible mass of people being added on our front doorstep and in the area in a short amount of time. Also, as highlighted, there is no budget or plan to match Kirkland PD’s growth with the massive number of new units. We would bear the brunt of additional crime while Lee Johnston enjoys the profits.

-Tod Johnston has begun acting unethically which highlights this request is bad for everyone but them. Up to now, Tod has been a good neighbor and has always reached out to let us know of what they are planning and worked with us where we might be affected. After he bought 8026 at the beginning of 2017 we met to discuss what he was planning and made agreements as to what they would. In the last year he has done none of what he said he would and when asked last year and again a few days ago he deferred to his admin as 'she knows what is going on with it' though we have never heard anything from his admin either. We now know he has been working on this proposal, indicating he specifically lied and kept this from us, likely to get it pushed through before we even know it was proposed. It is unethical and a good indication that he knows this is an opportunistic cash grab that will destroy our quality of life and the value of our homes.

To the rest of the proposals we have concerns as to the "hockey stick" size of the growth of the proposals being considered and the fact that they are being considered before Kirkland has determined how the massive increase in traffic from the immediate residents will be handled. Kirkland also has 'ideas' not plans for how traffic going to and from the rapid bus transit stop from the surrounding community will be handled or where they will park.

Our belief is that growth needs to be handled in a controlled manner with plans in place to handle it. The massive number of units being considered now is a 'land grab' for folks leveraging discussion around the BRT but it is not a plan. We would like to see only a few of these being considered this year and all the rest be deferred pending analysis and a concrete plan around how to handle the impact of the large increase in people from traffic to school capacity.

Regards,
Curtis Brown
President, Spruce Villas Owners Association
206-579-9988
Good afternoon,

It has been brought to my attention by my neighbors that you are making a proposal to change the zoning regarding the Bridle Trails Shopping Center. My wife and I live in the neighborhood, and we see ourselves impacted by those proposed changes.

We understand that evolution is needed and that the city wants to develop this area however we are strongly against the proposal that will authorize the construction of 5-6 stories buildings in the area of the Bridle Trails shopping center. This is very disproportionate to the rest of the neighborhood that is low density and mostly single family houses. Having a 6 stories building in the place of the shopping center is going against the reason why people have bought homes there with no added benefits for the current or future residents.

This proposed change will also bring a lot of new cars in a neighborhood that does not have the infrastructures (roads, public transportation, etc.) to support this extra traffic. Coming from Europe with larger and much older cities, I can assess that the densification of an area works from a development point of view where there is already a good infrastructure in place. Trying to spread the densification across the city only bring problems and higher maintenance costs since you need to maintain expensive infrastructure in more places.

The most logical approach would be to keep a maximum height of 2-3 stories as it is across the street for the Bridle Trails shopping center until it is actually reached. The current use of the shopping center is only one level, why supporting such a big change so fast?! Let’s have the shopping center reach its maximum capacity before allowing a disaster in this residential neighborhood.

Thank you for reading and best regards,
Damien Caro & Erika Vilches

This is the document that I used for my comments above.
https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/North+South+Rose+Hill++Bridle+Trails+Neighborhood+Plan+Update+09132018+PC+Meeting+Packet+-+CAM18-00082+N4+WEB_Part1.pdf
You have a great opportunity to expand the zoning on NE 85th and in Bridle Trails to create new neighborhood centers.

So it's important to not be timid. Bridle Trails, with the right supportive regulations, is ripe for redevelopment. NE 85th is already showing signs of life in the small area where the zoning allows dense construction. It can do a great deal more.

Be expansive on NE 85th. Don't restrict the rezones to a two-block circle around the freeway. Do, of course, include Costco, as it is within easy walking distance. Some on the Planning Commission are concerned about sales tax implications, but this site is too close to the BRT station to be excluded from potential redevelopment.

Look to widen the area where redevelopment is possible. The most cost-effective new housing is at the fire-code maximum for wood frame over concrete construction. That's six stories. Rose Hill rents won't make greater heights pencil, but lesser height limits increase the cost of housing and make it less likely too. Success in regenerating this neighborhood isn't an island of great height, it's lots of six-story buildings. Extend the footprint far enough back from 85th for developers to create quiet interior streets and publicly accessible spaces. People want to live away from the highway and the 5-lane arterial, so don't push all the development opportunity up against the traffic fumes.

Include properties further up the hill. All of the RH 5 zones can support mixed use at densities comparable to the Madison properties. Everywhere that is within walking distance of the BRT station should be considered for 75' heights. Most of 85th is within walking distance. It's also a near-term frequent transit corridor. Stopping at the RH 1-3 zones sets the bar far too low.

Allow the requested greater heights for Madison and Lee Johnson. The 75' heights will gain them a lot of flexibility, and consequently more housing.

At Bridle Trails, support enough density to support under-grounding the parking, and creating interior streets. Too low a height limit will just get you a slightly higher set of buildings around the parking lot. It won't be an attractive development at three stories, and it won't support very much housing. Take a look at the Lake Hills Village experience as a measure of what development looks like when it just pencils, but at too low a density to be an attractive or commercially successful neighborhood center.

https://www.facebook.com/groups/LiveableKirkland/permalink/1475387805896823/
Bridle Trails is still a successful strip mall, but it's perceptibly in decline. Involve commercial consultants and ensure all scenarios presented to the public are commercially viable. Don't let the preservationists kill redevelopment with over-the-top regulatory requirements.

Several of you supported the BRT station on NE 85th. I didn't. I thought the city would never allow the sort of development where it would make sense. I would be happy to be proven wrong on this. The Planning Commission needs clearer direction that they need to prioritize finding ways to make this work.

Thank you for your work.
Dan Ryan
425.260.9441

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hi Adam,

If a response is warranted, please respond within five business days.

Thank you.

Jeannie McGivern
City Manager’s Office
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov
(425) 587-3016

Subscribe to This Week in Kirkland and receive brief, timely news and notices about City-sponsored events.

Tourism Website: www.explorekirkland.com
Tourism Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/explorekirkland

I applaud Policy BT-7 in the draft Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan which encourages the increase in height of the Bridle Trails shopping center. Please keep the words in this policy ...“with an increase of height to 5-6 stories.” Any height increase will help beautify the dumpy two story structures and will most likely produce better shopping choices vs. massage parlors.
NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
My suspicion is you will get a lot of anti messages from the NIMBY element of the Bridle Trails area.

I live on the south edge of Bridle Trails (in Bellevue), and I have no problem with a 4-5 story development here – however I think you should make sure any rezone comes with developer givebacks of some kinds to reduce traffic impacts. Not sure if you can – but it seems to me you should be getting Metro involved as well.

Dave Fandel
Dear Sir/Madam & Kirkland Planning Commission:

We, Deepak & Nona Dhawan, are current homeowners at 6318 135th Ave NE, Kirkland, WA 98033 and have lived in this home, neighborhood and community for the past 18 years. Needless to say, this area is very dear to us and holds many fond memories of watching our children grow up and of forming enduring friendships with our neighbors. We fell in love with our home and the neighborhood when we moved from Los Angeles, CA in the year 2000. This neighborhood was almost perfect for all members of our family, and has remained as such for the past two decades.

The purpose for writing this note is to register our VERY STRONG OBJECTION to the proposed changes being considered by the city in our neighborhood. The significant changes proposed, especially the change in height restrictions, will indelibly alter the essence of this very precious neighborhood and community. We have watched silently as the tri-city local governments and councils have rapidly altered the landscape around us, not necessarily a positive development. Please give due consideration to the voice of those amongst us who prefer a different outcome than the one proposed. Thank you.

Respectfully,

Deepak & Nona Dhawan
Home: 425.869.7123
I am a resident of the Bridle trails neighborhood. I am also a realtor and understand the need for housing in Kirkland. However the proposal to rezone the Bridle Trails shopping center is something I am opposed to. We currently have overcrowding on our streets. I am not opposed to the current zoning and adding multifamily to the area. We are a unique neighborhood that encourages equestrian activities. The added the traffic and congestion would have an negative impact on this unique area. Lets think twice about saving this area of Kirkland that is so unique.

Diane Ginthner
'Specializing in Results'
Managing Broker
Windermere Capitol Hill
206 940 8908
The criteria being used to evaluate rezoning requests by the City of Kirkland seems very biased towards supporting increased density and economic growth. Applying this criteria to a rural, equestrian based neighborhood seems totally out of place, but I will offer a rebuttal to each of the criteria the City is attempting to use for the proposed rezone of the Bridle Trails neighborhood market. My rebuttals are brief in order to minimize the reader’s time.

The 10 criteria Kirkland Planning Dept has used to support their rezone recommendation:

1. **Consistent with vision statement?**  
   (YES - Future redevelopment of the shopping center is a shared vision in the draft vision statement as a community gathering place for local quality shops and services)  
   **REBUTTAL:** - *The Bridle Trails Shopping Center should, and already does, serve and support the adjacent neighborhood (same as the Houghton shopping center plan adopted on 12/12/17). There is no requirement to raise the height of buildings to fulfill this vision.*

2. **Compatible with adjacent uses?**  
   (YES - If buildings step up from lower height areas around perimeter of property to be more compatible with 2-3 story residential and commercial uses surrounding the property and across the street)  
   **REBUTTAL:** - *The Bridle Trails neighborhood is primarily a rural area of single family homes and horse properties. None of the adjacent buildings are 65 feet high. Increasing the height of buildings beyond currently allowed is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.*

3. **Redevelopment potential in the area?**  
   (YES - Existing uses: One story Shopping Center (built in 1980) and one story Tech City Bowl bowling alley (built in 1957))  
   **REBUTTAL:** - *The Bridle Trails neighborhood is primarily a rural, single family homes and horse properties.*

- As Kirkland City Manager Triplett stated recently regarding ‘bigger anchors’, “It will change people's perception – after the first building goes
in, people start to imagine another and developers and property owners move in.”

The basic equestrian nature of our BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood will disappear!

4. **Lack of environment constraints (streams, wetlands)?**
   (YES - No mapped wetlands or streams)
   **REBUTTAL:** Snyder Corner, across the street from the Bridle Trails shopping center, has a large water retention pond critical to handling drainage and runoff issues in order to minimize the amount of water flowing through Bridle Trails neighborhoods to the south. A history of law suits and complaints continue to require Kirkland to address and reduce this problem.

5. **Promote 10 minute neighborhoods?**
   (YES - Redevelopment of the site into a mixed use residential commercial neighborhood focus project promotes the 10 minute neighborhood concept for surrounding residents.)
   **REBUTTAL:** Developing a mixed use facility of the proposed size is totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood. Currently “walkers” account for less than .05% of the users of the shopping center. This will not dramatically change by increasing the height of buildings in the shopping center.

6. **Close to existing/planned bus lines with 15-minute or better service?**
   (YES - Bus route 245 provides service along NE 70th ST to Redmond-Kirkland. By 2025 more frequent service connection to transit centers: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothel)
   **REBUTTAL:** You don’t need to build a large, mix use complex which would be totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood to accomplish this goal. And who knows what happens if the major bus terminal proposed at 85th and 405 ever gets built. Even the traffic engineers have serious reservations about that project.

7. **Meets goals of Housing Strategy Plan?**
   (YES - Redevelopment would increase affordable housing opportunities.)
   **REBUTTAL:** The current BCX zoning permits 598 living units (59 affordable). There is no need to double this number in this neighborhood. There are plans for major affordable housing in Kirkland along 85th and in Totem Lake which meets and exceeds Kirkland’s GMA targets.

8. **Consistent with Comprehensive Plan?**
   (YES - New zoning for future redevelopment would be consistent with the land use, housing, and transportation policies to encourage mixed use development)
REBUTTAL: The VISION of the Comprehensive Plan for our Bridle Trails neighborhood should be: primarily serve the adjacent neighborhood - a rural, equestrian based community of single family homes. Urban creep sets in - dramatically changing the nature of this neighborhood.

- The Houghton shopping center, (a subset of the Bridle Trails Neighborhood) rejected attempts to increase building heights to 65 feet in Dec. 2017:

9. Economic benefits?
(YES - Redevelopment would allow for increase in jobs and could support higher quality retail establishments in shopping center.)

REBUTTAL: Economic benefits for who? The developer? The City?
There would be NO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR THE BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood.
This amounts to a complete change to the nature of the Bridle Trails neighborhood!

10. Unanimous property owner support?
(NO - As of 8/20/18: 14 people have submitted comments opposed to 60’+ height)

COMMENT: As of 9/12/18, 30 people have submitted comments OPPOSED to 60’ + height.
One person supports this proposal -
The criteria being used to evaluate rezoning requests by the City of Kirkland seems very biased towards supporting increased density and economic growth. Applying this criteria to a rural, equestrian based neighborhood seems totally out of place, but I will offer a rebuttal to each of the criteria the City is attempting to use for the proposed rezone of the Bridle Trails neighborhood market.

The 10 criteria Kirkland Planning Dept has used to support their rezone recommendation:

1. **Consistent with vision statement?**
   (YES - Future redevelopment of the shopping center is a shared vision in the draft vision statement as a community gathering place for local quality shops and services)

   **REBUTTAL:** - The Bridle Trails Neighborhood “Vision Statement” states: “The low-density residential character of the neighborhood should be maintained.” Even the current “draft” of an updated Comp Plan states: “For the residential area east of I-405, the policy direction is to maintain the low density residential quality of the neighborhood.”

   There is no requirement to raise the height of buildings to fulfill this vision.

2. **Compatible with adjacent uses?**
   (YES - If buildings step up from lower height areas around perimeter of property to be more compatible with 2-3 story residential and commercial uses surrounding the property and across the street)

   **REBUTTAL:** - The Bridle Trails neighborhood, adjacent to the shopping center, is primarily a rural, single family home and horse properties. None of the adjacent buildings are 65 feet high. Increasing the height of buildings beyond currently allowed is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

3. **Redevelopment potential in the area?**
   (YES - Existing uses: One story Shopping Center (built in 1980) and one story Tech City Bowl bowling alley (built in 1957))

   **REBUTTAL:** - The existing zoning for the shopping center permits ample development of commercial and residential units.
• Kirkland City Manager Kurt Triplett stated recently regarding ‘larger buildings’, “It will change people’s perception – after the first building goes in, people start to imagine another and developers and property owners move in.”

*Increasing the building height at the shopping center will be a slippery slope and, over time, the basic equestrian nature of our BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood will disappear!*

4. Lack of environment constraints (streams, wetlands)?

(YES - No mapped wetlands or streams)

**REBUTTAL:** *Snyder’s Corner, across the street from the Bridle Trails shopping center, has a large water retention pond critical to handling drainage and runoff issues in order to minimize the amount of water flowing through Bridle Trails neighborhoods to the south. A history of law suits and complaints continue to require Kirkland to address and reduce this problem.*

5. Promote 10 minute neighborhoods?

(YES Redevelopment of the site into a mixed use residential commercial neighborhood focus project promotes the 10 minute neighborhood concept for surrounding residents.)

**REBUTTAL:** *If the City’s goal is to increase density to achieve this criteria, it is totally inconsistent with the “Vision” for our neighborhood. The proposed rezone might increase density but would be totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood.*

6. Close to existing/planned bus lines with 15-minute or better service?

(YES - Bus route 245 provides service along NE 70th ST to Redmond-Kirkland. -By 2025 more frequent service connection to transit centers: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothel)

**REBUTTAL:** *You don’t need to build a large mixed use complex, which would be totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood, to accomplish this goal. And who knows what happens if the major bus terminal proposed at 85th and 405 ever gets built. Even the traffic engineers have serious reservations about that project.*

7. Meets goals of Housing Strategy Plan?

(YES - Redevelopment would increase affordable housing opportunities.)

**REBUTTAL:** *The current BCX zoning permits 598 living units (59 affordable). There is no need to double this number in this neighborhood.*

*Furthermore, there are plans for major affordable housing in Kirkland along 85th and in Totem Lake which meets and exceeds Kirkland’s GMA targets.*

8. Consistent with Comprehensive Plan?
(YES - New zoning for future redevelopment would be consistent with the land use, housing, and transportation policies to encourage mixed use development)

REBUTTAL: The VISION of the Comprehensive Plan for our Bridle Trails neighborhood includes the following statement:

“Due to the equestrian nature of the area, development in the vicinity should be limited to low-density equestrian-oriented residential.” And the current zoning permits mixed-use development on a scale consistent with the Comp Plan.

- By the way - the Houghton shopping center, (part of the Bridle Trails Neighborhood) rejected attempts to increase building heights to 65 feet in Dec. 2017:


9. Economic benefits?
(YES - Redevelopment would allow for increase in jobs and could support higher quality retail establishments in shopping center.)

REBUTTAL: Economic benefits for who? The developer? The City?

There would be NO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR THE BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood.

This amounts to a complete change to the nature of the Bridle Trails neighborhood!

10. Unanimous property owner support?
(NO - As of 8/20/18: 14 people have submitted comments opposed to 60’+ height)

COMMENT: As of 9/13/18, 34 people have submitted comments opposed to 60’ + height.

One person supports this proposal -

I urge you to reject the proposed rezone of the Bridle Trails shopping center

Don Prince
6021 – 136th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
From: Don W. Davis  -  2 Bridlewood Circle - Kirkland, WA 98033 - 425-822-3439

My family has resided here for fifty five years, and are totally opposed to the proposed zoning changes to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan Update. Bridle Trails Park is a unique asset to the area. We believe the current zoning and character surrounding Bridle Trails Park should not be changed.

1. To allow increased density in Silver Spurs is to open the door for further increases in the future.

2. To allow construction to six stories with apartments and commercial space in bridle trails shopping center is ridiculous. The impact to traffic, schools, and general congestion would be huge. We do not want to become downtown Kirkland.

The developers who propose these zoning changes are the ones who benefit financially. Should these changes be approved, they should be required to pay for substantial mitigation for their contribution to the increased demand for city services, utilities, schools, etc.

Don W. Davis
I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

- Please amend Policy BT-7 in the Bridle Trails community plan by deleting any reference to changing the current height restriction for buildings in the Bridle Trails shopping center.

- Thank you

Don Prince
6021 – 136th Ave NR
Kirkland
The criteria being used to evaluate rezoning requests by the City of Kirkland seems very biased towards supporting increased density and economic growth. Applying this criteria to a rural, equestrian based neighborhood seems totally out of place, but I will offer a rebuttal to each of the criteria the City is attempting to use for the proposed rezone of the Bridle Trails neighborhood market. My rebuttals are brief in order to minimize the reader's time.

The 10 criteria Kirkland Planning Dept has used to support their rezone recommendation:

1. Consistent with vision statement?
   (YES - Future redevelopment of the shopping center is a shared vision in the draft vision statement as a community gathering place for local quality shops and services)
   **REBUTTAL:** The Bridle Trails Shopping Center should, and already does, serve and support the adjacent neighborhood (same as the Houghton shopping center plan adopted on 12/12/17). There is no requirement to raise the height of buildings to fulfill this vision.

2. Compatible with adjacent uses?
   (YES - If buildings step up from lower height areas around perimeter of property to be more compatible with 2-3 story residential and commercial uses surrounding the property and across the street)
   **REBUTTAL:** The Bridle Trails neighborhood is primarily a rural area of single family homes and horse properties. None of the adjacent buildings are 65 feet high. Increasing the height of buildings beyond currently allowed is incompatible with the surrounding neighborhood.

3. Redevelopment potential in the area?
   (YES - Existing uses: One story Shopping Center (built in 1980) and one story Tech City Bowl bowling alley (built in 1957))
   **REBUTTAL:** The Bridle Trails neighborhood is primarily a rural, single family homes and horse properties.

   - As Kirkland City Manager Triplett stated recently regarding 'bigger anchors', “It will change people’s perception – after the first building goes in, people start to imagine another and developers and property owners move in.”

   The basic equestrian nature of our BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood will disappear!

4. Lack of environment constraints (streams, wetlands)?
   (YES - No mapped wetlands or streams)
   **REBUTTAL:** Snyder Corner, across the street from the Bridle Trails shopping center, has a large water retention pond critical to handling drainage and runoff issues in order to minimize the amount of water flowing through Bridle Trails neighborhoods to the south. A history of law suits and complaints continue to require Kirkland to address and reduce this problem.

5. Promote 10 minute neighborhoods?
(YES Redevelopment of the site into a mixed use residential commercial neighborhood focus project promotes the 10 minute neighborhood concept for surrounding residents.)

**REBUTTAL:** Developing a mixed use facility of the proposed size is totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood. Currently “walkers” account for less than .05% of the users of the shopping center. This will not dramatically change by increasing the height of buildings in the shopping center.

6. **Close to existing/planned bus lines with 15-minute or better service?**

(YES - Bus route 245 provides service along NE 70th ST to Redmond-Kirkland. -By 2025 more frequent service connection to transit centers: Downtown Kirkland, Totem Lake, Redmond, Kenmore, Bothell)

**REBUTTAL:** You don’t need to build a large, mix use complex which would be totally out of character for the Bridle Trails neighborhood to accomplish this goal. And who knows what happens if the major bus terminal proposed at 85th and 405 ever gets built. Even the traffic engineers have serious reservations about that project.

7. **Meets goals of Housing Strategy Plan?**

(YES - Redevelopment would increase affordable housing opportunities.)

**REBUTTAL:** The current BCX zoning permits 598 living units (59 affordable). There is no need to double this number in this neighborhood.

There are plans for major affordable housing in Kirkland along 85th and in Totem Lake which meets and exceeds Kirkland’s GMA targets.

8. **Consistent with Comprehensive Plan?**

(YES - New zoning for future redevelopment would be consistent with the land use, housing, and transportation policies to encourage mixed use development)

**REBUTTAL:** The VISION of the Comprehensive Plan for our Bridle Trails neighborhood should be: primarily serve the adjacent neighborhood – a rural, equestrian based community of single family homes.

Urban creep sets in - dramatically changing the nature of this neighborhood.

- The Houghton shopping center, (a subset of the Bridle Trails Neighborhood) rejected attempts to increase building heights to 65 feet in Dec. 2017:


9. **Economic benefits?**

(YES - Redevelopment would allow for increase in jobs and could support higher quality retail establishments in shopping center.)

**REBUTTAL:** Economic benefits for who? The developer? The City?

There would be NO ECONOMIC BENEFITS FOR THE BRIDLE TRAILS neighborhood.

This amounts to a complete change to the nature of the Bridle Trails neighborhood!

10. **Unanimous property owner support?**

(No - As of 8/20/18: 14 people have submitted comments opposed to 60’+ height)
COMMENT: As of 9/12/18, 30 people have submitted comments **OPPOSED to 60” + height.**
One person supports this proposal -

-
Sent from my iPhone

Begin forwarded message:

**From:** Carolyn Adams &lt;cac.architect@comcast.net&gt;  
**Date:** September 13, 2018 at 1:38:54 PM PDT  
**To:** Bhanu Purohit &lt;bhanu274@gmail.com&gt;  
**Cc:** Mark Plesko &lt;glesko@outlook.com&gt;, Joann Pearson &lt;joann.pearson@live.com&gt;, Donald & Alice Prince &lt;DFPSeattle@aol.com&gt;, Bill Gurrad &lt;wggurraddds@comcast.net&gt;, Anne Corley &lt;anne@corleycompany.com&gt;, Bill Dolan &lt;wbdolan@outlook.com&gt;, Kim Meyer &lt;kim-meyer@live.com&gt;, Natalia Dvorak &lt;natalia.dvorak@gmail.com&gt;, Michael Goltitz &lt;golitzma@aol.com&gt;, Jill Pierson &lt;jillpierson@hotmail.com&gt;, Chris Pearson &lt;jdpluscp1@aol.com&gt;, Teresa Prekaski &lt;prekaski7@aol.com&gt;, Amy Rosser &lt;kokopellix@hotmail.com&gt;, Christy Zylstra &lt;christyzylstra@gmail.com&gt;, Hui Dai &lt;ravenswoodwa@gmail.com&gt;, Rena Peterson &lt;rena@renapeterson.us&gt;, Tyler & Kathy Carper &lt;ahkat@hotmail.com&gt;, "hgribskov@hotmail.com" &lt;hgribskov@hotmail.com&gt;, Wray & Barbara Featherstone &lt;fxidaho@aol.com&gt;, Stephanie DiJulio &lt;mrsdi julio@gmail.com&gt;, Sean McAteer &lt;sean_mcateer@hotmail.com&gt;, Deb & Frank Pampiks &lt;debrandfrank@comcast.net&gt;, Chris Tott &lt;christott@comcast.net&gt;, Allan & Mary Donley &lt;vandamme donley@gmail.com&gt;, Jeff Allen &lt;jeffallen@live.com&gt;, Jon Conklin &lt;conklinjd@comcast.net&gt;, Rick & Rennie Carlson &lt;rickrennie48@comcast.net&gt;, Bill Ginthner &lt;billginthner@yahoo.com&gt;, Don Kaufman &lt;donk@mimish.org&gt;, Melissa Cook &lt;macookcorpor@outlook.com&gt;, Jennifer Donahue &lt;jennifer@dodu.us&gt;, Scott & Kim Skorupa &lt;kimskorupa@msn.com&gt;, Bill Bistritz &lt;billbis24@yahoo.com&gt;, Mark Corley &lt;mark_corley@hotmail.com&gt;, Katharine Hunt &lt;kathy_hunt@outlook.com&gt;, April Petersen &lt;miss_aprilp@yahoo.com&gt;, Michelle Plesko &lt;michelle.plesko@outlook.com&gt;, Steve Allison &lt;skalliso@gmail.com&gt;, Becky Hastings &lt;hastingsbh@aol.com&gt;, Alice Prince &lt;af prince42@aol.com&gt;, Ben Zylstra &lt;bzylstra@renaware.com&gt;, Chris DiJulio &lt;cdi juliojr@gmail.com&gt;, Debbie Tott &lt;debbietott@comcast.net&gt;, Patty Allen &lt;pattyallen28@hotmail.com&gt;, Sheilagh Conklin &lt;sheilaghc@comcast.net&gt;, Diane Ginthner &lt;ginthner@windermere.com&gt;, Mehri Kaufman &lt;nurse mehri@gmail.com&gt;, Steve Donahue &lt;ste ve@dodu.us&gt;, Sarika Calla Purohit &lt;scall@microsoft.com&gt;, Dave & Laurie Fulton &lt;la rief.davidfi@frontier.com&gt;, Harley Davidson &lt;madmahan@comcast.net&gt;, Mary Ann Joy &lt;maryannjoy@hotmail.com&gt;, David Bielak &lt;dbielak@icloud.com&gt;, Scott Thompson &lt;scott@scottandjessica.com&gt;, Pete & Olga Lymberis &lt;lymberis@msn.com&gt;, Dave Fulton &lt;davewe b543@gmail.com&gt;, Lyle & Kay Matznick &lt;lyle.matznick@frontier.com&gt;, Vera Karakash &lt;verakarakash@comcast.net&gt;, Megan Davidson &lt;magdavidson@frontier.com&gt;.
Hello All,

While I have recently moved to Seattle, I certainly oppose this project. This development, and others like it, which have sprung up all over Kirkland and Redmond, are part of the reason I have moved. My daughter and I came to Kirkland because of the unique and amazing horse environment, the quality of the neighborhood, its proximity to Seattle and East Side destinations, as well as its natural beauty.

This project, and others like it, detract from all of the above. I am not opposed to the urban lifestyle; in fact I’ve moved into it, IN THE CITY.

Fast growing metropolises—Bellevue is a prime example—provide some urban amenities but lack the heart and soul of a “good” city. Kirkland, unfortunately, has fallen victim to this uninspired urban development pattern.

The reasons for the rezone are complex. Essentially, though, urban growth is mandated throughout the state in order to quell sprawl. There is no easy solution.

But, without protecting the unique character of exceptions neighborhoods—such as Bridle Trails—the entire inner east side rapidly becoming a vast, homogeneous, traffic snarl.

Thanks, Carolyn Adams

On Sep 11, 2018, at 6:05 PM, Bhanu Purohit
<bhanu274@gmail.com> wrote:

Something for everyone to think about:

Have you stood on 132nd and Old Redmond Way intersection and visualized what a 6 story building would look like at the planned location.

It will look very out of place and an eye sore - in my opinion. And since I live on 132nd directly and would be closest to such a building, I would be directly impacted with such a change to the skyline.

From what I have observed, high height buildings are restricted to
certain areas - specially areas near transit centers (Totem Lake) and downtown (Kirkland and Redmond). This location does not fit either criteria and certainly is not a location for a transit center.

On a related note - the bowling alley is a great gathering and social place for entire Kirkland and Redmond. They would all hate to lose that to a 6 story (majority) residential project.

I understand that everyone is entitled to their own opinion and visualization of a neighborhood.

Thanks,

Bhanu

On Tuesday, September 11, 2018, Mark Plesko <plesko@outlook.com> wrote:

I believe that these concerns are overstated here.

1. More specifically, we lost Red Apple because rents are overall rising and the customer base could not rise along with it. Part of this is that no one lives in the shopping center. Part of this is that most of the BT/SRH area does not permit much additional housing either. We now have businesses with smaller footprints and different business models, and our neighborhood (in my opinion) has now suffered because of it.

2. If it is economically feasible, why are the developers telling the city that it isn’t? More telling, why are they remodeling the single story space, and why did permits show up last year for a new drive-through instead of 30 foot redevelopment? Why aren’t the owners jumping at the chance to redevelop at Houghton’s constrained limits? It seems like a bit of an assumption that it will become profitable in the next years, especially if the neighborhood wants that development to include higher quality retail with higher building costs. On the other hand, we do see redevelopment occurring at the 5-6 story size.

3. This is an oversimplification of traffic. Yes, those people will travel. Some of them will drive (and note: the more parking that the city requires, the more cars and driving that they will do). Some of them will travel by other means. We are centrally located on the eastside and it’s quite possible to live without driving everywhere. 132nd and 70th are full of people driving through our neighborhood today. They
choose to do so because the capacity is there and better for them than using 520/405/85th/etc. If we widen it, it will be more attractive and more of them will choose it over those other roads. If we add local traffic or prioritize walking in the neighborhood, it will make the cut-through less appealing and some of it will go back to the other roads. We have roads in a convenient location, so they are going to be used by people. I’d rather them be neighbors. I’d rather reach a critical mass of people to have better bus service and better biking and walking accommodations.

4. It’s not reasonable to just brush off the problems as “larger dynamic economic factors”. Yes, there are things that we don’t control like the existence of lots of jobs. No, by itself a single development does not magically solve everything. But demand has been growing rapidly, and supply has not been keeping up because each small area like Houghton and Bridle Trails is refusing to add 1,100 units each. If you have enough neighborhoods with 1,100 units, then you actually impact the regional supply and can start to look at any other problems.

Not “consistent or compatible” is subjective, so if you don’t like the idea of other people living nearby, then I’m not going to convince you otherwise. I personally don’t find a huge parking lot to be consistent with anything around it either. I would find a good grocery store to be much more compatible. I selfishly like the idea of growth in the shopping center being enough to support good businesses there so that we can have nice stuff next to our low density neighborhood.

5. I’m not sure what you’re arguing against here. While it is still part of the community, the shopping center is a lesser part of my life than it used to be.

6. Kirkland is far behind the county in growth, and the county as a whole isn’t keeping up as evidenced by the sprawl outside of it. I would be happy to dig up the data on this if you would like to see it. Downtown Kirkland isn’t even a regional growth center (Totem Lake is). If the current residential growth is leading to a scarcity, then how will rejecting more housing help?

Best,

Mark Plesko
Subject: RE: Criteria used to evaluate rezone of Bridle Trails shopping center

The rezoning issue has given us all a lot to think about and we should consider the pros and cons of the rezoning issue carefully. Rezoning would impact our Bridle Trails neighborhood forever.

Some of the reasons I'm concerned over rezoning the bridle trails shopping center to build 60+ feet, 6 story with over 1,100 new residential units and retail include the following:

1) We didn’t lose Red Apple and Dairy Queen because of the lack of this proposal for rezoning.

2) The current 30 foot zoning allows 598 new residential units plus retail. It is economically feasible already. As real estate prices increase over the next 5 years it becomes even more profitable.

3) Traffic will increase exponentially if this is approved.

The traffic north and south, east and west will only get worse with over 1,100 units. It will introduce more traffic from residents, their families, friends, service vehicles, work commutes, etc.

1,100 new residents will be driving to work. There is no business district close or walkable to bridle trails shopping center. There will be more cars on the road by allowing this rezoning.

132nd Ave and 70th aren’t expected to be expanded.

4) Allowing the rezoning of our small bridle trails shopping center to over 1,100 residential units will not solve the housing issues in Kirkland, Bellevue, Redmond or Seattle. There are larger dynamic economic factors influencing housing. Also, this rezoning is not consistent or compatible with the surrounding homes and buildings in our neighborhood.
5) The shopping center is already part of the community. It doesn’t need rezoning to 6-story and over 1,100 units to stay a part of our neighborhood.

6) Kirkland has had progressive density in the appropriate downtown and business areas for years. It hasn’t and won’t solve the real estate scarcity and increasing housing costs.

Best regards,
Joann Pearson

On Sep 11, 2018 11:52 AM, Mark Plesko <plesko@outlook.com> wrote:

There are many possible benefits to a rezone of our commercial area: the return of a good grocery store, a more inclusive community, and more. These won't happen with the current zoning limit of 3 stories.

We recently lost the Red Apple Market and now have much a lower quality option. The entire region is growing, and we live in a very desirable area, so housing demand is significantly up. Since the entire Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill area has essentially retained the same zoning - and therefore the same housing supply - this has led to large demographic changes in the neighborhood. This has led to the large number of teardowns and, according to the Red Apple owners, less demand for a neighborhood grocery store. Having more people increases our chances of having higher quality retail in our shopping area, and it is likely that the demographics of the residents in such a development would support that as well.

Several years ago, we lost Metro route 265 and its direct service to Seattle. We are rather fortunate with our current population to currently have the 245 with its 15-minute service. The 245 is unlikely to go away, but there will be increasing pressure to serve other areas. To maintain, or hopefully improve, its service level, we need more riders.

The region's growth has led to an incredible housing shortage, marked by huge increases in living costs and sprawled development to the north, east, and south. This has been forced by a lack of
housing across the region, starting with Seattle but also including places like Houghton and our neighborhood. Kirkland's desire to be a welcoming and inclusive community is effectively blocked by a lack of housing options. We are losing police officers because they can't live nearby. Teachers are forced to live far away, and so on. Despite developments such as Kirkland Urban and Totem Lake, Kirkland lags behind most of the region. Not only is there an Affordable Housing shortage, but there is a lack of affordable housing even for the middle class. I'm constantly talking to people that I would love to have as neighbors who are turned away by Kirkland's market. This rezone is one way that we can both contribute to solving this problem as well as strengthen our community.

The main concern with development is the effect on traffic. However, the status quo, both locally and in the region, is the major contributor to traffic. 70th and 132nd are alternate routes for commutes such as Microsoft to north Kirkland, Bothell, and even beyond. A main cause of traffic is people living far from their destinations in car-dependent areas. Many of the people who can't live in our neighborhood center will be the ones driving down 70th. Grocery Outlet's business model is dependent on people from a wide area making multiple stops to do their grocery shopping. We have traffic because we've forced it on ourselves. New development, of course, isn't a magic solution that makes that traffic go away, but local traffic does tend to displace cut-through traffic, and having more people that are closer together enables more options such as walking, biking, and transit, which give us alternatives to being stuck in traffic.

It is an odd thing that we have these shortages while the current 2-3 story zoned potential sits unused. Feedback from developers seems to indicate that the costs of construction generally don't work out at this height, which is why we don't see so many mixed-use 3-story buildings and haven't seen any activity on the Houghton parcels. This is especially true when we make demands for large retail spaces (like that needed for a grocery store), community space, infrastructure improvements, and so on. These are good things, and they can be worth including in a plan, but they can't happen unless the overall project is worth doing.

For those that would like to see these additions in our community, whether it is a grocery store, better bus service, or something else entirely, please send your support to the planning commission and include the amenities that you would like to see.
From: Joann Pearson <joann.pearson@live.com>
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 5:43 PM
To: Don Prince <DFPSeattle@aol.com>; 'Bill Gurrad'
    <wggurraddds@comcast.net>; 'Anne Corley'
    <anne@corleycompany.com>; 'Carolyn Adams'
    <cac.architect@comcast.net>; 'Bill Dolan'
    <wbdolan@outlook.com>; 'Kim Meyer' <kim-meyer@live.com>
'Mark Plesko' <plesko@outlook.com>; 'Natalia Dvorak'
    <natalia.dvorak@gmail.com>; 'Michael Golitz'
    <golitzma@aol.com>; 'Don Prince' <dfpseattle@aol.com>; 'Jill
    Pierson' <jillpierson@hotmail.com>; 'Chris Pearson'
    <jdpluscp1@aol.com>; 'Teresa Prekaski' <prekaski7@aol.com>
'Amy Rosser' <kokopelli@hotmail.com>; 'Christy Zylstra'
    <christyzylstra@gmail.com>; 'Hui Dai'
    <ravenswoodwa@gmail.com>; 'Rena Peterson'
    <rena@renapeterus.us>; 'Tyler & Kathy Carper'
    <ahkat@hotmail.com>; <hgribskov@hotmail.com>; 'Wray & Barbra
    Featherstone' <fxidaho@aol.com>; 'Stephanie DiJulio'
    <mrdsijulio@gmail.com>; 'Sean McAteer'
    <sean_mcateer@hotmail.com>; 'Deb & Frank Pampiks'
    <debandfrankcomcast.net>; 'Chris Tott'
    <christott@comcast.net>; 'Allan & Mary Donley'
    <vandamme_donley@gmail.com>; 'Jeff Allen'
    <jeffallen@live.com>; 'Jon Conklin' <conklinjd@comcast.net>
'Rick & Rennie Carlson' <rickrennie48@comcast.net>; 'Bill
    Ginthner' <billginthner@yahoo.com>; 'Don Kaufman'
    <donk@mimish.org>; 'Melissa Cook'
    <macookcorp@outlook.com>; 'Jennifer Donahue'
    <jennifer@dodu.us>; 'Scott & Kim Skorupa'
    <kimskorupamsn.com>; 'Bill Bistritz' <billbis24@yahoo.com>;
'Bhanu Purohit' <bhanu274@gmail.com>; 'Mark Corley'
    <mark_corley@hotmail.com>; 'Katharine Hunt'
    <kathy.hunt@outlook.com>; 'April Petersen'
    <miss_aprilp@yahoo.com>; 'Michelle Plesko'
    <michelle.plesko@outlook.com>; 'Steve Allison'
    <skalliso@gmail.com>; 'Rebecca Hastings'
    <hastingsbh@aol.com>; 'Alice Prince' <afprince42@aol.com>
'Ben Zylstra' <bzylstra@renaware.com>; 'Chris DiJulio'
    <cdijuliojr@gmail.com>; 'Debbie Tott' <debbietott@comcast.net>
'Patty Allen' <pattyallen28@hotmail.com>; 'Sheilagh Conklin'
    <sheilaghc@comcast.net>; 'Diane Ginthner'
    <ginthner@windermere.com>; 'Mehri Kaufman'
    <nursemehri@gmail.com>; 'Steve Donahue' <steve@dodu.us>;
Hi Don, thank you for sending this summary. I hadn't realized that the 60+ foot zoning change could include 1,197 new residential units as well as commercial space.

The current 30' zoning already has tremendous redevelopment potential without any zoning changes. It allows for 598 residential units and somewhat larger commercial space than the rezoning.

I appreciate your keeping us informed!
Best regards,
Joann Pearson

On Sep 10, 2018 11:48 AM, Don Prince <DFPSattle@aol.com> wrote:

Attached is a copy of the page in the Kirkland Planning Commission packet I referred to in my other email that summarizes the criteria used to “support” a rezone of the Bridle Trails shopping center.

If you can attend the Planning Commission mtg this Thursday at 7pm and willing to take 3 minutes to speak, please address one or more of these criteria.
I’d love to hear from you if you have a rebuttal to any (or all) of these criteria so we could make a list of why we’re opposed to this rezone – and we could send these counter arguments to everyone before the meeting.

Thank you for your support

Don Prince
Adam,

If a response to this e-mail is warranted, please reply in five business days.

Thank you.

Jeannie McGivern
City Manager’s Office
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov
(425) 587-3016

Subscribe to This Week in Kirkland and receive brief, timely news and notices about City-sponsored events.

Tourism Website: www.explorekirkland.com
Tourism Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/explorekirkland

From: Don Prince [mailto:DFPSeattle@aol.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 4:11 PM
To: Amy Walen <AWalen@kirklandwa.gov>; Jay Arnold <JArnold@kirklandwa.gov>; Tom Neir <TNeir@kirklandwa.gov>; Penny Sweet <PSweet@kirklandwa.gov>; Toby Nixon <TNixon@kirklandwa.gov>; Dave Asher <DAsher@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>
Cc: City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: RE: Change to Policy BT-7 in the Draft Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan

On Tuesday, as you review the policies that are being used to update the Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan, I urge you to modify Policy BT-7 which, as currently written, specifies a rezone to increase the height of the Bridle Trails shopping center.

The draft wording for policy BT-7 states:

"Policy BT-7 for the Bridle Trails shopping center has been revised to support future redevelopment of the center into an active, walkable, transit supportive, mixed use neighborhood center, with an increase in building height to 5-6 stories"
This is not a policy – it dictates a rezone as part of the objective.
The current BCX zoning serves our rural, equestrian oriented neighborhood very well. Any height increase is not compatible with our neighborhood nor necessary to support the primary objective of BT-7.

*Please delete the words in this policy ...”with an increase of height to 5-6 stories.”*

Thank you
Don Prince
6021 – 136th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
When you review the next update to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan, or proposed re-zones in the Bridle Trails community, PLEASE drop your support of Policy BT-7 – increasing the height of buildings in the Bridle Trails shopping center from 30 feet to 60+ feet.

Just one year ago Houghton citizens turned out in large numbers to reject an effort to increase the height and size of buildings within the Houghton Shopping Center. The citizens want to preserve the nature of that portion of the Bridle Trails neighborhood – as do we who live close to the Bridle Trails shopping center.

As stated in Kirkland’s draft Bridle Trails neighborhood plan, Policy BT 1 “Retain and preserve the low density residential and equestrian character of the neighborhood while accommodating compact new housing opportunities where consistent with equestrian use.”

Your neighbors living closest to the Bridle Trails shopping center are the very ones who “preserve the equestrian character” of Bridle Trails.

Increasing the height of buildings in the shopping center from 30 feet to 60+ feet will change the very equestrian character of the Bridle Trails neighborhood!

If residents in the Houghton area objected to height increases of the Houghton Shopping center, why would you support this change in the Bridle Trails shopping center?

Please drop your support of Policy BT-7.

Don Prince
Resident of Bridle Trails
Past President, Bridle Trails Park Foundation
From: Don Prince [mailto:DFPSeattle@aol.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 11:25 AM
To: Houghton Council <houghtoncouncil@kirklandwa.gov>; Rick Whitney <RWhitney@kirklandwa.gov>; John Kappler <JKappler@kirklandwa.gov>; Bill Goggins <BGoggins@kirklandwa.gov>; Betsy Pringle <BPringle@kirklandwa.gov>; Kelli CurtisHCC <KCurtisHCC@kirklandwa.gov>; Neal Black <NBlack@kirklandwa.gov>; Brian Gawthrop <BGawthrop@kirklandwa.gov>
Cc: 'Wray & Barbra Featherstone' <fxidaho@aol.com>; 'Lyle' <lyle.matznick@frontier.com>; 'laurief.davidf' <laurief.davidf@frontier.com>; 'Bill Gurrad' <wggurraddds@comcast.net>; 'Chris Pearson' <jpluscpl1@aol.com>; 'Bhanu Purohit' <bhanu274@gmail.com>; 'Mary Ann Joy' <maryannjoy@hotmail.com>
Subject: Please help us change Policy BT-7 in the Draft Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan

On Tuesday, the Kirkland City Council will review the policies that are being used to update the Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan. Please help us modify Policy BT-7 which, as currently written, specifies a rezone to increase in height of the Bridle Trails shopping center to 5-6 stories, the same issue you rejected last year for the Houghton shopping center.

The current draft wording for policy BT-7 states:

“Policy BT-7 for the Bridle Trails shopping center has been revised to support future redevelopment of the center into an active, walkable, transit supportive, mixed use neighborhood center, with an increase in building height to 5-6 stories”

This is not a policy – it dictates an expected result – a rezone,

Many Bridle Trails neighborhood residents, including those living within the Houghton jurisdiction east of I-405, have written letters to the Kirkland Planning Commission, and spoke at last Thursday’s planning meeting, stating opposition to a specific rezone request. The Planning Commission was being asked to approve further study but only agreed to do so in fear the Kirkland City Council would send it back to them given the current wording in policy BT-7.

The Houghton Community Council has a vote on the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Comprehensive Plan so we urge you to voice your opposition to BT-7 as currently written. (Even if there is not enough time prior to Tuesday’s Kirkland City Council meeting to send a message from the Houghton Council, each of you could do so.)
- Please send a message to the Kirkland City Council and ask them to delete the words in this policy "with an increase of height to 5-6 stories."

- citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov

The current Bridle Trails shopping center BCX zoning serves our rural, equestrian oriented neighborhood. Any height increase is not necessary to support the primary objective of BT-7.

On behalf of the many Bridle Trails residents living east of I-405, we thank you for your help in getting policy BT-7 changed.

Don Prince

6021-136th Ave NE

Kirkland, WA  98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hi Joan and Janice
It is good to see you at open house and sorry you didn’t get my email but here’s my request for my property at 12822 NE 85 Kirkland WA 98033 -To be commercial zoning
- taller building to allow 3 story building 35 feet
- reduce set back
- minimize parking stall requirement
Thank you so much for your help.

Best regards
The cave craft beer and smoke
12822 NE 85TH Kirkland WA 98033
Tel 425 242 0294
Www.cavecraftbeer.com
Hi Janice,

As a Bridle Trails resident, I just heard about the proposed re-zoning of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center to allow 6 story buildings. I think this is a terrible idea! This is a quiet residential neighborhood. There's nothing like that here. And undoubtedly it would spread over time. This isn't downtown Kirkland or Redmond or Bellevue!

Let me strongly urge you to keep the current height limits in our neighborhood.

There's also talk of generally increased commercial and housing density around (in place of?) the shopping center and bowling alley. Something consistent with the neighborhood character sounds fine, but please let's not have visions of a "downtown Bridle Trails" sprouting out in the middle of our quiet residential neighborhood.

I'm new at this, so I don't know the right questions to ask or things to say. If there are ways to get involved, like meetings to attend, documents to provide feedback on, etc please send me links to them.

Thank you for your consideration.

Eric Michelman
From: Eric Burke [mailto:eburke@econobox.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 6:27 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Bridle Trails- ROIC Development

I am very concerned with this plan going into this neighborhood. There is already apartment/condo's right next door to this new development plan and our local schools are at capacity as is. I am against this plan and the thought of it being 4-5 stories is alarming.

Concerned neighbor,

Eric Burke
206-849-7898

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
To: Kirkland Planning Commission

Subject: Rezoning properties at 8231 124th Ave NE and 8239 124th Ave NE, Kirkland 98033

Request that the planning commission of Kirkland consider rezoning the properties from RS 7.2 to Medium density multifamily (RM 3.6). Two sixty year old houses currently occupy these respective lots. The property just to the north is zoned medium density while the property south of 8231 124th Ave NE is zoned RS 7.2.

The park to the east of 124th would give future residents a recreational area along with a playground for children. The two lots together would enable a developer to design an optimal medium lot community.

Erich Mock
To: City of Kirkland, Planning and building department

Subject: Rezoning update: 8231 124th Ave NE, Kirkland Wa, 98033

6 August 5, 2018

I recently composed a letter to the board requesting that my property be reevaluated for a zoning change. After attending the planning meeting at city hall in Kirkland I would like to amend my initial recommendation. Due to the significant changes to the area around 85th, I would like to see the area changed to commercial use.

The development of the bus rapid transit center located within a ten minute walk from this property would be ideal for commercial use. Safeway and Walgreens are located very close to this area and the beautiful park on the east side of 124th provides open space for walking and family activities.

The future changes which will enhance public transportation to this area of Kirkland will enable an increase in zoning density,

Sincerely

Erich Mock
Hello –

I live on 6415 125th Ave, a bit west of this proposed rezone/development plan. I wanted to confirm there is an open meeting on Thursday September 13th and its location and time?

My greatest concern regarding rezoning and building at Bridle Trails shopping (corner of 132nd and 70th) is traffic. I have children that commute to Rosehill MS by bike every day. I frequently bike with them noting the heavy commuter traffic on 70th St NE and 132nd Ave NE. Even with the awesome flashing pedestrian light by Pagliacci’s (thank you!), cars do not always stop and slow down. I know the City of Kirkland is promoting biking and walking instead of driving. If we are going to increase density here than the City must address the traffic. We can not count on or assume most new residents will not be driving. Will more flashing cross walks be added to 70th and 132nd be added? A pedestrian light is needed at 120th Ave by the High School and Holy Family. Will the speed limit be dropped? Will traffic lights be added? If we want this to remain a family centric community, then planning for the additional traffic is critical.

Another safety concern is while developing is occurring, how will the traffic and congestion of all the heavy equipment be managed? The project in front of the middle school last spring was well managed but still very tricky with students coming and going. The construction crews and developers need to be held accountable for their impact on the community and our safety.

Thank you for considering my comments,
Evelyn Bundesmann
425-753-8312

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege.
asserted by an external party.
Dear Planning Commissioners and Ms. Coogan –

I attended Thursday night’s Planning Meeting. It was the first City meeting I’ve attended aside from the school shooting/safety meeting last fall. It was an educational experience seeing how our city operated. I was appreciative to how much time the commissioners allowed for audience comments. Thank you. You hear the but coming, right?

I was happy to hear Commissioner Carter Bragg and John Tymczyszyn originally proposed to not move forward with the Bridle Trails / Tech City development. But then the commissioners rolled back and moved the study along while failing to ask the Planners to address many of the concerns raised by the community earlier.

Looking at the Planning evaluation criteria, ‘Yes’ is listed where I believe ‘No’ is a more accurate answer:

1. Compatible with adjacent uses: Glenn Peterson felt 6 stories was too much but 5 stories was possible. Where in Kirkland is there a single family zone where 5 stories of apartments/condo/retail reside? From the planners, there is a one such area in Juanita Village but it does not border directly with single family homes. Even Downtown Kirkland currently only has 4 story buildings and one 5 story building in construction. Five stories is excessive for this neighborhood. I could support 3-4 stories, four stories max especially if they are tiered as discussed. We have apartments and condos east of the BT Shopping center that are 3 stories to the east. These structures blend well with the community with their tree coverage and green space. Since Bridle Trails shopping is already commercial, a large structure would really stand out.

2. Lack of Environmental constraints: We don’t have the wetlands or streams but we are an equestrian neighborhood and border on Bridle Trails State Park. We have high equestrian, foot and bike traffic. The integrity of the equestrian paths are very important to our community.

3. The 10 minute neighborhood and 15 minute bus lines: The commissioners did not proceed on the Jin or Morgan developments due to lack of land owner support and distance from the Regional transit zone. Bridle Trails is even further from the Regional zone and does not have a direct bus route to 85th Street. If you google routes, the best way to travel to 85th and 120th is walking 1.6 miles. How does this plan fit with the 15 minute commute?

Let’s go back to the notes regarding the possible addition of 598 units with the current BCX zoning or 1,197 units with the 65’ building height (from attachment 2 of RHBT85). Adding 598 units will be a strain on our roads. Even if 50% of owners use the bus to Redmond or Kirkland, that still brings 250 cars traveling on 70th / Old Redmond Way and 132nd Ave. These roads are hazardous for middle schoolers and walkers crossing with our current commuter traffic. How will it be when you add this density? And the requested 65’ would be 1,197 units. The area cannot absorb this safely on our roads. If you cap at 5 stories as Glenn Peterson suggested, that is still 993 units (5/6 of 1197).

As I have previously stated, this is a family neighborhood. I look for my government to keep the roads safe for walking, horses, bike riding and cars. Many families here ride their bikes to work,
school, parks and to the BT shopping center. We cross 70th and 132nd Ave to visit with school and
team friends. Bridle Trails does not look like downtown Kirkland, Juanita Village area or 85th St
corridor. I can endorse adding housing per the existing BCX zoning. Having mixed housing and
affordable housing is great. But those that want this new housing want a livable community not
clogged with traffic and the inability to bike around safely. Finally, many community members asked
about school capacity for all these units. Ben Franklin, Ben Rush, Rosehill Elementary schools are
bursting. Rosehill Middle school has 1000+ students.

In my mind, other unanswered questions are looking at how much commuter traffic is already on
70th St. Are we going to grow this street to look like 85th? I feel we need to look for ways to route
commuters to 85th street not 70th. Increasing traffic on 70th St will cut our community even further,
creating small community islands penned in by traffic.

Finally, I ask why does the community of Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill have to provide ROIC with
more density to create more shoppers? ROIC made a business decision to terminate two strong
community establishments (Dairy Queen and Red Apple) in favor of new renters at a higher rental
rate. The business owners need to figure out their business not the City or the community. If they
had worked with the community, they may have found ways to achieve higher rents and remain
favorable to the community. Both Dairy Queen and Red Apple had strong community ties and drew
neighbors into the BT shopping center. It is yet to be seen if the new establishments will draw as
many customers. But again, the neighborhood does not need to increase density to help these
businesses.

Thank you,
Evelyn Bundesmann
6415 125th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Pan - Policy BT7 changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use & higher density. This would significantly change the character & safety of our neighborhood.
Debra Pampiks

Sent from my iPhone

Deb Pampiks
From: Gary Penitsch [mailto:garypen1@aol.com]
Sent: Monday, September 17, 2018 8:40 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Comments on ROIC--Bridle Trails proposed development

Hello,

I am very concerned that Kirkland is “out of control” with development. It has been less than 20 years that the downtown Kirkland core area has gone from a small, quaint, sleepy type town to a “mega city”. Everywhere one looks in downtown Kirkland, you see nothing but 5-6 story buildings. I understand that “that is progress”. But by allowing this development to creep into other neighborhoods, is poor long-range planning. In 1990, King County adopted the Growth Management Plan, in which cites would now absorb most of the growth and not the County. As a result, King County downzoned all of the land in the rural areas from one acre minimum lots to 5-acre minimum lots. Since then, very few zoning changes have occurred in the County as King County is “preserving” this rural land for future generations. The City of Kirkland should be doing the same thing. Let’s keep the dense development in the downtown core and let’s allow the Houghton, Rose Hill, Bridle Trails, Norkirk, Highlands and Totem Lake neighborhoods alone. Keep the development in the downtown core where it belongs. There is still plenty of land available in the downtown core to accommodate additional development. In 20-30 years, let’s see where Kirkland is at with development. Maybe the downtown core will need to be expanded, but not today!

Thank you!

Gary Penitsch
Coldwell Banker Bain
206-799-6101

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hi Commissioners,

Thank you for reaching out for public input regarding the rezone request initiated by Martin Morgan. My wife Rita and I live in the area effected by this request at 8221 122nd Ave NE. I strongly support the push for higher density housing, especially near planned transit hubs. I spent much of my young adult life in Portland, and I witnessed first hand the transformative power of mass transit coupled with intelligent public planning. Everywhere the max line (the Portland light rail system) went, neighborhoods were revitalized.

Regarding the options available for the Morgan rezone, I am opposed to rezoning this area as Commercial. There are already areas zoned Commercial, that, if I am not mistaken, are underutilized. Rather than building more office spaces that will not be filled up, we should be looking for ways to increase available housing in our area. In principle I like the idea of Mixed Use Commercial/Multifamily, but it seems that the area just along 85th would make much more sense for this option. The strip mall on the SW corner of 122nd Ave NE and NE 85th St is a great example of a location that could be rezoned as mixed use before building in the Morgan area. My other concern with putting commercial or mixed use zoning in this location is the potential for increasing traffic on 122nd. This street already has significant problems with people using it as both a parking lot and as an arterial between Starbucks and the High School. A good step to consider along with this rezoning would be both traffic calming measures and the installation of bike lanes along the length of 122nd.

Thank you for your consideration!
Geoff Freeman
503-860-3011
8221 122nd Ave NE
Kirkland WA 98033
I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.”

Diane Ginthner
'Specializing in Results'
Managing Broker
Windermere Capitol Hill
206 940 8908
The proposed plan for “downtown bridle trails” high-rise is out of place in our neighborhood. We lived in Kirkland (near MetroMart) for 5 years prior to moving to Bridle Trails, and do not believe this proposed project is a good idea at all. We do not need broader shopping, and the location is not good for a 5 or 6 story housing. Thank you, Gwen Bernacki
Hi
I am a resident of Bridle Trails Bellevue and I oppose the rezoning of the bridle trails shopping center.

Sheli Hadari
September 12, 2018

To: Sr. Planner Joan Lieberman-Brill and Planning Commission

City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033

Re: South Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update and Land Use or Zoning Change File CAM18-00082 #2

Dear Planning Commission and Senior Planner Joan Lieberman-Brill,

We, residents of 12222 NE 82nd LN Kirkland WA, are writing in response to the proposed study for the re-zoning of the Rose Hill Neighborhood area, in particular area “4- Morgan”. We have been homeowners since year 2000. Once a quiet street, 122nd Ave has become overrun by cars trying to bypass 85th traffic. Traffic from Lake Washington High School, and local businesses such as Starbucks at the corner of 85th & 122nd have increased traffic to a dangerous level. Starbucks drive-thru customers often block 122nd, and at times back-up onto 85th street. Local businesses commonly park on the side of street which effectively transforms 122nd into a one-way street, making it necessary to yield to the nearest open shoulder to allow two cars to pass one another.

Collectively these conditions are making this street dangerous to approach from our driveways due to limited visibility caused by cars parked on both shoulders. It is a matter of time before a serious accident or casualty occurs.

Regarding the area number “4 – Morgan” on the list of proposed re-zoning to office or multi-family residential our concerns include:

Traffic and Parking issues along 122nd Ave NE between NE 85th and NE 80th Streets

- This street (122nd Ave) has reached maximum capacity and further congestion will exacerbate the dangers this causes.
- Adding commercial business or multi-family units will increase traffic flow, and thereby intensify those conditions noted above.

Our recommendation is to maintain the current zoning of these properties:

- The City to maintain low-density residential housing as the primary land use in the areas south of the current commercial zoning along NE 85th Street, east of 120th Avenue NE.

Public Walkway along NE 82nd Lane

We and our adjacent neighbors are also concerned about pedestrians using our private lane, NE 82nd Lane, which functions as a shared driveway. When backing our cars out of our garages, it is difficult to see pedestrians who walk across easements and in NE 82nd Lane. Sometimes joggers, children, and/or dogs run outside our line of vision and sometimes distracted mothers
are inadvertently pushing strollers into our car paths. We are concerned about safety, for ourselves and for pedestrians who are walking/jogging in NE 82nd Lane.

**We recommend:**
If the City is determined to keep the pedestrian walkway by using easements on private land, the City needs to address safely concerns by constructing and **maintain** a walkway for pedestrians to keep pedestrians from walking/running in NE 82nd Lane, which is a shared driveway. At a minimum, signage should be added at both ends of NE 82nd Lane encouraging pedestrians to stay on the pavement and to be aware of reversing vehicles. We strongly feel that by using private street City should make this street public and maintain it as all other public streets.

Sincerely,

Irina Sinitsyna and Don Holman, residents of 12222 NE 82nd LN, Kirkland WA 98033
Phone: 206.372.4947
Email: 1zsinitsyna@gmail.com
I live in Bridle Trails and have been here for 25 years. The shopping center has had a lot of turnover with many shops going out of business because of low volume. There is barely enough business to keep most shops viable and certainly not enough for additional shops. If the locals want more shopping, they go to Kirkland, Redmond, or Bellevue.
September 13, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Planning Commission
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033-6189

Re:  Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are writing on behalf of LMJ Enterprises, LP, owner of the property located at the southeast quadrant of the I-405 interchange at NE 85th Street (the “Property”). The Property comprises zones 2A, 2B and 2C in the Rose Hill Business District in the Kirkland Zoning Code (the “Code”).

In July, we presented suggestions to the Planning Commission regarding further refinements to the zoning proposal for the Property. This has been carried forward as #6 in your staff report to the Planning Commission dated August 4, 2018 (the “Staff Report”). We have had an opportunity to review the Staff Report and wanted to offer the following comments:

• We strongly endorse the recommendation to allow this proposal to proceed to public hearing.
  o It is important that the additional height apply to a large enough portion of the site to make a real density difference.
  o We also believe that the lot coverage and parking requirements for the site need to be addressed.

• For the longer-term proposal (160' heights), we suggest that waiting until the transit station is complete to consider this proposal may be too late. Planning, permitting and construction of a major project takes 5 years at least. That is close to the time window within which the transit station will be complete. Market interest in more substantial development of the site will begin before the transit center opens, not afterward. It is important to create the vision now, or else the site may just be developed as wood-frame 75’ product. At that point, the higher density alternative is lost.
Our proposal would create a path to a higher density plan now, but the path would not be certain. It would be enough to attract interest—serious interest—in the plan now, before lower-density options take over. But by involving the City Council in final decision-making, continuing high levels of City scrutiny would be assured.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to the public hearing.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John C. McCullough

cc: Tod Johnson
    Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
    Janice Coogan
-----Original Message-----
From: Janka and Michael Hobbs [mailto:MJCT_Hobbs@msn.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 13, 2018 1:41 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Bridle Trails Shopping Center Rezone

Dear Kirkland Planning Commissioners,

We are strongly opposed to allowing Bridle Trails Shopping Center to build out to a five story behemoth. The existing zoning allows for residential housing over retail; perhaps give them a variance for two floors of residential, for a total of three.

The neighborhood is primarily residential/semi-rural. The tallest building in the area is three stories; most are single story residences. The only people who will benefit from having a high rise stare down at us (and add more glare to our night skies) are the developers of this project.

Plopping an urban high rise development into the middle of the equestrian oriented Bridle Trails neighborhood makes no sense. We are a full mile from the 85th Street corridor. 132nd Avenue and 70th Street are already over capacity at rush hour. Promising us "expanded bus service by 2025 (Maybe)" will not solve these problems. I don't think the term "ten minute neighborhood" was intended to mean "it takes ten minutes before you can turn onto the arterial."

The demand for more affordable housing can be met within the existing zoning, which allows for residential over retail space.

Thank you,

Jana and Michael Hobbs
13506 NE 66th St
Kirkland, WA 98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello,
I wanted to write to object to approving rezoning of the shopping center at Bridle Trails. This is a residential neighborhood with traffic issues and a 5 story building is not only out of place, it is bad for the infrastructure and bad for other residents.

We strongly object to you approving rezoning.

We live in Bridle Trails.

Thank you,
Fay and Jason Hanleybrown
Hello Commissioners,

I recently attended the SRH/BT NA meeting on Sept. 11th and your meeting on Sept. 13th and since not everyone can speak at these meetings, it was suggested that we write to you to speak of our personal position on this matter.

I have been a resident of Bridle Trails for 53 years. Yes, really. And in that time, having served 15 years in the Lake Washington School District PTSA in various positions, as well as a board member, VP and President of the SRH/BT NA, I feel that I understand what this neighborhood wants and deserves.

It’s not that we don’t want ANY growth, we just want it more controlled, so as to not destroy the VERY REASONS we all love to live here for. Many of those reasons are dwindling away every day.

I see that the shopping center is struggling and my neighbors and I are MORE THAN DISGUSTED with the loss of Red Apple for such a low-end “grocery” store. I use that word loosely. We realize changes need to be made. Most of us agree that adding 2 or 3 stories on top of the center for housing makes sense.

Our frustration is the amount of SHEER GREED in this town and all the developers that just will not stop until every square inch of dirt has a building on it.

We highly suggest that you hold a public meeting at Ben Franklin with preliminary project ideas/drawings and let us have some input in this enormous change coming to us.

I’ve been here since BEFORE the center was built and I remember the shock of the neighbors back then. We could live with the 3 stories above the ground story, making 4 total, but still so many unanswered questions about parking and cars and traffic that I hope you take a long time to really investigate this plan and imagine that YOU LIVE right next door to it and see how YOU would feel with the proposed 6 stories next door.

I believe that there are much better placements of 6 story units right along the south side of NE 85th St, with those small outdated strip mall business and old small homes that have been turned into businesses. It makes much more sense to knock those down and build up from there where the streets can handle the loads, not really, and the land is already zoned for that.

Keep the high density, tall buildings out of our immediate neighborhood.

That’s my 2 cents on that and thanks for reading.

Sincerely,

Jeanette Simecek
12015 NE 61st St
Kirkland, WA 98033
425.828.6808
NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Ms. Coogan,

Re Daniel Weise's rezone proposal in Silver Spurs: Daniel is a friend, but I think the neighborhood will be better off if the zoning remains as it is. Silver Spurs is kind of a green belt; people from the surrounding areas like to stroll down the pleasant gravel road. While Daniel's place is on the northern edge it overlaps Bill Anderson's lot and could start pressure to break up the rest of the place.

Thanks,

Jeff Evans
6162 128th Ave NE
I’m writing to express my strong opposition to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet, including mixed use and higher density development. I feel this would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood. I specifically oppose the plan policy change for the following reasons:

1) Consistency with the vision statement. There is absolutely no guarantee that increasing the density and adding 1197 residential units would attract “local quality shops and services”. In fact, as we experienced when Red Apple Market left the shopping center, neither the community nor the local government has any say over what retail outlets property owners seek. There is nothing about the current shopping center (nor the currently allowed 30’ elevation development and 598 residential units) which is incompatible with the draft vision statement.

2) Compatibility with adjacent uses. The proposed increased density development is absolutely not compatible with adjacent uses. We live in a low-density equestrian community. People keep and ride horses. There is no way in which the additional density and the resulting traffic and noise is in any way compatible with this residential neighborhood. This is not downtown Redmond or downtown Kirkland. It is a neighborhood.

3) Increase in “affordable” housing (per housing strategy plan). The current zoning allows for 598 residential units with 59 marked as affordable housing. Doubling the total allowable residential units only adds 40 additional affordable housing units. Doubling the allowable residential density to add only forty additional affordable units isn’t in any way worth the disruption and cost to the neighborhood.

4) Unanimous property owner support - absolutely not. I haven’t spoken with any current neighborhood resident (or commercial tenant of the current shopping center) who supports this proposal.

5) The support for this proposal focuses on the “economic” benefits of the plan. However, it is ignoring the detriments that accompany this population density. Traffic on NE 70th and even 132nd is already horrendous. It shouldn’t take me 20-30 minutes to drive from downtown Redmond to my home in Bridle Trails, yet it regularly does. And this is not downtown Seattle, Kirkland, Bellevue or Redmond. People drive cars. They drive cars to and from work. They drive cars to take children to sports practices, to go to the doctor, to get to mass transit centers. You will be adding thousands of cars to an already congested area. I have seen no evidence or report by the city on how they will address this issue. Choosing to “believe” that people will magically begin using mass transit is naive at best, and in reality, simply irresponsible. Furthermore, a development of this density will also be adding hundreds of children to the local schools, which are already using portable classrooms because they have exceeded capacity. I understand that developers are required to pay the education impact fees. However, those fees are not enough. And there is a significant lag time between when developers pay those fees and schools can receive and use those fees to actually address overcrowding that development of this scale causes.

As representatives of the the Bridle Trails community you serve, I strongly urge you to reject Neighborhood Plan Policy change PT 7.

Thank you,
Jennifer Donahue
To whom It may Concern:

“I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood”. It would bring increased traffic as well. We like our neighborhood the way it is.

There is a school nearby that my child attends the traffic is already busy and we do not need more development, but less. I like the shopping center the way it is. It provides everything that residents and homeowners need in this area. We do not need more development.

Thank you for your consideration
Jill Pierson
Planning Commissioners:

I am opposed to the rezone proposals for Study Area 8 (Daniel Weise) and Study Area 9 (Bridle Trails Shopping Center) for reasons given below.

**Study Area 9 (Bridle Trails Shopping Center)**

I am in favor of the idea of mixed use of the shopping center that would include apartments and affordable housing along with retail commercial use, but I am opposed to the proposed increase in building height to 65’ for both Tech City Bowl and Bridle Trails shopping center properties. Six-story buildings would be completely out of scale with the existing development in the neighborhood and would threaten the quality of life in this low-density, equestrian friendly area. The Existing BCX zoning (Option A) would allow a building height of 30 feet above existing average building elevation. Planning staff have determined that the current BCX zoning would allow 135,794 sf gross floor area commercial and 598 residential units (59 affordable). That level of residential development would serve to support the business in the shopping center without jeopardizing the quality of life in this equestrian-focused neighborhood. One to two floors of residences above the ground-level retail would be an appropriate level of development.

The request (Option B) to increase building height to 65’ would result in a severe clash of scale with the surrounding neighborhood, much of which is single family residential, with some nearby properties supporting horses. The proposed reduction in commercial space by about 27,000 sf would reduce the primary function of the shopping center in order to add far too many residential units for this neighborhood. This is not a reasonable trade-off.

I disagree with the staff recommendations and the scoring for several criteria in the criteria matrix. (1) I do not agree that this proposal is consistent with the vision statement in the neighborhood plan, and I think the majority of those participating in the planning process would not support the proposed height increase and reduction of retail space. (2) I do not think the height increase is compatible with adjacent or nearby uses, which include single family residences and horse properties. (3) I note that nearly all comments received so far oppose the height increase.

In short, the existing zoning allows a reasonable level of commercial and residential use. Early in the neighborhood planning process, City of Kirkland planners said that existing zoning was sufficient to meet projected growth in the area. Thus, there is no need for the rezone, and the shopping center is not the place to accommodate this much residential growth. If building height is increased, it should be no higher than needed to accommodate one level of retail.
(ground floor) and two levels of residential above.

**Study Area 8 (Daniel Weise)**

I oppose the rezone of the three subject properties (Option B) from LDR 1 RSX 35 to LDR 5 RSX 7.2. The subject properties are on the edge of the Silver Spurs neighborhood, which is one of the few remaining neighborhoods in Kirkland with residential lots that can accommodate horses. From the beginning, the development of the Bridle Trails neighborhood took place with a focus on Bridle Trails State Park, because of the equestrian use of the park. The loss of several more properties that could keep horses would undermine the well-being of this very special park. There is no compelling reason for the rezone, and it would be inconsistent with the vision for the Bridle Trails Neighborhood. Please keep the existing zoning (Option A).

Thank you for considering my comments.

Jim Erckmann  
26 Bridlewood Circle  
Kirkland, WA 98033  
425-827-6595

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
-----Original Message-----
From: Jim & Linda Hoff [mailto:jnlhoff48@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 12:25 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Bridle Trails Center Plan

I write in support of a plan to develop the BT shopping area into a well planned mini urban center. I am in favor of a plan for a multi-use facility that incorporates retail businesses, service and professional businesses, and apartment home living. I would require it to be walker and biker friendly with underground parking and interior open spaces with very limited vehicle access. In terms of the height limits I would limit the height along NE 70 to six stories where the slope is greatest moving down to five stories as you approach 132 Ave NE. The remainder of the development would be a mixed height of four and five stores on about a fifty fifty ratio on the space. I would also consider having 130th Ave not be an ally like access, but more of a parking and inviting open plaza to the whole facility.

I have lived in the Rosehill area since 1963 and I have watched suburban sprawl take over this entire area without an effective plan that incorporated a vision of what to do with an increasing population. I see this as a true opportunity for the future and a major step that might stop the current infill we see happening especially in the South Rosehill area. This opportunity might be the most realistic way to save more of the single family homes on decent sized lots that so many people want to keep in our area.

In closing I want the planning commission to have the courage to be futurist in thinking in spite of the mostly emotional outpouring of feelings against a major change for the future. I say this from the position of a nearly 79 year old man who knows we need to deal with the future now and I will not be the beneficiary of the future planning results.

James Hoff
12830 NE 73rd St.
Kirkland, Wa. 98033
425-828-6868
Jnlhoff@msn.com

Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Kirkland Planning Commissioners,

I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

The bridle trails shopping center is literally in the middle of a neighborhood. Increasing the zoning height may further enrich the owners and developers but it will not enrich our neighborhood.

Also, it is NOT consistent or compatible with the surrounding homes, buildings and neighborhood. The current 30 feet, 2-story zoning is consistent with adjacent use. A change to 60+ feet, 6 story (or 55 foot, 5 story) zoning is NOT consistent with adjacent use.

Positioning a zoning change to 60+ feet as similar or compatible to the adjacent small developments across the street or the neighborhood is false. Has anyone in planning even driven in our neighborhood?

Also, is there any understanding of the current traffic and the layout of streets and neighborhood? Is there any understanding of the impact of this change? I live in the Bridleview neighborhood across the street from the bridle trails shopping center. I currently have trouble exiting our neighborhood during morning and evening rush hour due to high volume traffic. What will be the impact of this zoning change that could allow 1,197 new residential units and commercial space. The current zoning already allows for 598 new residential units and commercial space.

Additionally, the Bridle Trails Shopping Center (Bridle Trails) Request and the planning recommendation is incredibly misleading. One glaring issue is that the property can be redeveloped within the current 30 foot zoning and meet ALL the 10 criteria Kirkland Planning Dept has used to support the rezone recommendation. There is already enormous redevelopment potential within the current zoning.

Please respect our neighborhood and community and do not make this zoning change.

Beat regards,
Joann Pearson
From: John Weale [mailto:jweale@gmail.com]
Sent: Sunday, September 9, 2018 12:07 AM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: I support housing, so I support prudent upzoning for higher density

Hello,

I am a South Rose Hill resident who has been hearing a great deal about proposed upzoning along 85th and at the TechCity Bowl/Bridle Trails shopping center.

I would like to see more apartments in our city since they tend to be inherently more affordable - a 500SF one bedroom will always be more affordable than a stand alone home. In addition, the coming 405 rapid bus transit stop is an excellent opportunity to provide transit-oriented housing.

In the last 5 years, the cost of a house in this area has literally doubled. It would be nice if a teacher just out of college could consider living in our community rather than having to commute in to our schools, and that will never happen if the modern modestly priced home options - multi-story apartments - are banned by outdated zoning. The zoning changes described at https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Land+Use+Study+Areas.pdf all appear worth further study. (Although I am skeptical of the Weise property proposal #8 - we have enough million dollar homes on 7200 SF lots - but still worth a study.)

Regards,

John Weale
7526 126th AVE NE
Kirkland, WA, 98028

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Dear Kirkland Planning Commission,

Thank you for including the community in the current and upcoming re-zoning discussion. We are residents of the South Rose Hill community and our property, located at 8234 122nd Ave NE, is within the expanded “Morgan” study area, on south side of 85th street. We have reviewed the proposed zoning changes and we have two main comments: 1) we do not support commercial zoning in the expanded Morgan area, but 2) we are open to modest density increases if they are joined with likewise improvements to traffic flow.

The Commission’s recommendation of RM 3.6 multi-family residential is a reasonable balance that increases density without upending the residential characteristics of the area. While we are not opposed to increasing the density of surrounding properties (modestly), we are not interested in including our property in the proposed rezoning study. And again, we want to reiterate that we are opposed to commercial zoning in the study area.

Finally, we’d like to emphasize that we are concerned about traffic congestion and the parking along 122nd Ave NE. With increased traffic we will also see an even greater amount of gridlock at the intersections of 85th and 122nd NE. We’d like to see better traffic-flow solutions for vehicles travelling both north & south bound on 122nd Ave NE, intersecting with 85th. For example, we would like to see dedicated left-turn lights or traffic circles and other measures. Combined with the new residential developments north of 85th Street (in the Petco/Tuesday Morning shopping area), the proposed re-zone will exacerbate this issue. The rezoning plans should also address how to solve for increased parking demand along 122nd Ave NE.

Thank you for your consideration,

Jordan Mandel-Iaia & Diana Choksey
8234 122nd Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Dear Ms. Brill and Ms. Coogan,

I’ve read over the neighborhood plans you are responsible for and would like to add my comments. We’ve lived in the South Rose Hill area since 1996, first in Kirkland for four years, and for the last 18, just over the line in Redmond, next to Grasslawn Park. The boundaries have always been fluid in this area, and your plans for Kirkland affect everyone in the west side of Redmond, as well. The neighborhood’s character is defined in, as the combining of your plans acknowledges, a shared interest in the neighborhood’s identity and future.

The Bridle Trails redevelopment issue is a very sensitive topic to residents, as you know. It’s a great concern to us that the residential flavor of the Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill neighborhood is changing rapidly with approval of the multi-family development off of 85th.

The Kirkland area is rapidly coming to resemble Seattle with its mix of in-fill and older remodeled homes and apartments/condos and all the inherent traffic and public safety concerns that go along with it. School density is already at capacity at Rose Hill Elementary and Ben Franklin Elementary, as well as Rose Hill Middle School, which, as you know, were rebuilt a decade ago using ill-fated population projections; portables on the elementary school sites attest to the poor planning by the school district. The developers don’t support any of the additional costs incurred by stretching the schools’ capacities even further. It’s time to push back on the assumption that greater density is where we’re headed at any cost to our neighborhood’s livability and quality of public schools.

Allowing multi-family mixed-use development of Bridle Trails Shopping Center is a huge mistake that will change the nature of these neighborhoods for generations to come. ROIC was able to oust Red Apple and Dairy Queen without the attendant public outrage having any effect. "It’s just business." But when it comes to zoning changes, the citizens are beyond outraged at the presumption that the city has the right to approve an encroachment like a multi-story mixed use urban development project in the heart of the neighborhood. The increase in traffic alone will affect walkability and the change the feel of the neighborhood to an urban center rather than the quiet residential neighborhood it is.

I hope you will be very careful in your review and find the right reasons to deny taking the redefinition of our neighborhood deeper than has already been allowed. You don’t owe the developers anything. They’ll move on to their next economic opportunity if you stand up to them. And the citizens will be very grateful for your courage in doing so. We don’t want to become another Seattle.

Sincerely,
Julie Painley
6901 143rd Ct NE
Redmond, WA 98052
August 6, 2018

City of Kirkland
Planning Department
123 Fifth Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033

Attn: Janice Coogan

Re: Bridle Trails Subarea
Bridle Trails Shopping Center

Dear Ms. Coogan:

I live in the Bridle Trails area of Kirkland. I am concerned about the plans for the Bridle Trails Shopping Center. I understand the owners desire to change the zoning to allow buildings to go to five or six stories. The Bridle Trails area is primarily low density, single family residences, many of which have room for horses. There is a rural feel to the area. Allowing buildings to go to five or six stories is out of character for the area and should not be allowed. I would support allowing Bridle Trails Shopping Center to go to two or three stories, but five or six stories does not fit in with the area.

Thank you for considering my comments.

Very truly yours,

Karen Hall
6104 123rd Avenue Northeast
Kirkland, WA 98033
klhall@ymail.com
425-739-0751
From: Katherine Morris [mailto:katherinesuemorris@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 6:12 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Planning Commission study on proposed land use/zoning/code amendment change
requests (in Rose Hill and Bridle Trails)

Dear Planning Commission,

I’ve been a home owner in South Rose Hill for about 14 years and I regret that the quality of life will reach a new low with your zoning plans.

We do not need more traffic, we do not need more apartments, we do not need more construction, and we do not need more crime.

What are you thinking?

Respectfully,
Katherine Morris

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
From: City Council
To: Adam Weinstein
Cc: Janice Coogan
Subject: FW: Objection to Policy BT-7 - Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan
Date: Monday, September 17, 2018 4:19:54 PM

Adam,

If a response is warranted, please respond within five business days.

Thank you.

Jeannie McGivern
City Manager’s Office
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov
(425) 587-3016

Subscribe to This Week in Kirkland and receive brief, timely news and notices about City-sponsored events.

Tourism Website: www.explorekirkland.com
Tourism Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/explorekirkland

From: Kat ^_^ [mailto:ahkat@hotmail.com]
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 9:57 PM
To: City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Objection to Policy BT-7 - Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan

Hi,

I want to email you to let you know that I object to Policy BT-7 in the draft Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan. This policy encourages the increase in height of the Bridle Trails shopping center. Please delete the words in this policy ...“with an increase of height to 5-6 stories.”

The current zoning serves our rural, equestrian oriented neighborhood. Any height increase is not necessary and will not be supported by the
residents!! It is going to be an eye sore, and with no infrastructure for traffic growth, it will hurt this community driving housing value down.

I STRONGLY oppose to this!

Thanks,
Kathy Carper
Kirkland, WA

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

This is a LOW density neighbourhood. We do not have any building over 2 stories tall, building anything higher is an eye sore and changes the density of the neighborhood.

Thank you for listening.

Thanks,

Kathy Kam
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I own a unit in Overlook Village, a complex of 11 free-standing, two-story homes which shares a property line with the Lee Johnson Property. We recently became aware of Lee Johnson’s proposal to increase the height and density limits on its property. This comes on the heels of learning of the proposed New Bethlehem Project’s permanent shelter, with which we share another property line. We are reeling from all of these proposed changes, and fear the negative effects they would have on our quiet, residential neighborhood. The increased noise, traffic and tall/large buildings would greatly impact the quality of life in our community. Perhaps height and density limits could be slightly raised on the portion of the parcels directly abutting 85th street, but they should not be so raised on the parcels or portions thereof that are located further south and uphill.

Unfortunately, I am unable to attend tonight’s meeting, and am thus writing this letter. We respectfully ask that you bear in mind our concerns at tonight’s hearing.

Thank you,
Kellee Brown
8022 118th CT NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
From: Kent Sullivan [mailto:kent@sosufamily.net]
Sent: Monday, September 10, 2018 11:20 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Cc: 'Julie Solon' <julie@sosufamily.net>
Subject: Update to Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan

Greetings,

I spoke with Janice Coogan today. Regretfully I will be out of town during your meeting on September 13. Here are a few comments to consider:

I live at 6407 126th Ave. NE, two blocks west of Daniel Weise. If I recall correctly, our property (which is three separate, adjacent parcels of varying shapes and sizes) is zoned R7.2 and is nearly two acres total, but we intentionally chose to develop it with just one house and two outbuildings. Our property is across 126th Ave. NE from two properties that are one house per "horse acre" (not sure of zoning designation), and our front entrance faces 126th Ave. NE.

As can be seen, with the choice Julie and I made 15 years ago, there is a consistent change in density at NE 65th St., between 125th Ave. NE and 128th Ave. NE. I strongly support that consistency be preserved, with the one-house-per-acre (or so) density south of NE 65th St.

Of note is that 126th Ave. NE also breaks at NE 65th St. and is unimproved from there south to where NE 64th St. would be. 128th Ave. NE does essentially the same thing, nearer NE 64th St. I would think that if the allowable houses-per-acre were increased for lots between NE 64th St. and NE 65th St., and numerous houses were built, N-S connectivity would need to be created on 126th Ave. NE and 128th Ave. NE, which is in direct conflict with decades of Bridle Trails residents’ wishes, due to the very-likely increase in cut-through traffic, especially at the beginning and end of work days.

I also understand that Mr. Weise has asserted that allowing more houses per acre would increase the number of affordable units of housing in this area. I suppose “affordable” could be a relative term, but I don’t think that is the spirit of the word. Any such houses in R7.2 zoning in this area are fetching well over $1 million dollars these days; with several in the $1.5 million range. That does not strike me as affordable.

Thanks for listening,

--Kent

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hi, I would like to protest and complain about the way this notice was presented. The plan for the development of the Lee Johnson dealership is much too large of a development and would decrease the quality of life and impact traffic in a very bad and detrimental way. Plus, the last minute presentation of this information in conjunction with the meetings was very shady and immoral.

cc. King5,Kiro7,Komo4
To whom it may concern,  It seems that most all of what I read and hear from people surrounding the Bridle Trails shopping center is about their concerns regarding the negative impact on the area/neighborhoods and that they are strongly opposed to it. The latest news reported from the neighborhood planning meeting was that the rezoning of the area to allow the construction of a six story complex is “moving ahead”. Since I also strongly oppose these plans, I’m wondering what it would actually take to stop this from happening. Is there a measurement of some kind? Is a petition signed by a certain number of people necessary? Or, is this really just a case, because it’s the law that you allow people to give their opinions, that those very people are wasting their breath and those with the big money will have their way? I was recently called for a survey for my opinion rating the Kirkland planning commission. My basic response was neutral to somewhat negative. As I watch the proceedings in this case and hear about some others I have definitely been pushed to completely negative side. Sincerely, Laurel Westall
Hello Kirkland Planning Commission,

Thank you for drawing our attention to the proposed rezoning on our street - 122nd Avenue NE (Morgan) - and for informing us of the expanded study which now includes our home and property at 8232 122nd Ave NE (expanded study area). We would like to attend this evening’s meeting, unfortunately it takes place at the same time we’re attending curriculum night for two of our children at Rose Hill Elementary, so we will attempt to convey our opinions and recommendations regarding these proposals via email.

It seems to us that the main goal of the Kirkland City Council, Planning Commission and Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association is to find pockets within our neighborhoods where ‘missing middle housing’ can be found, walkability and access to the new rapid transit center is maximized and the housing shortage is solved. We are in favor of change - we know it is inevitable especially in the throes of booming growth. However, we are hoping to maintain (and hopefully) enhance the way of life for current residents at the same time.

What attracted us to South Rose Hill back in 2002 when we purchased our home was the easy access to many amenities - near I-405, restaurants, coffee shops, shopping, groceries, all within walking distance - not to mention the fact that our future children would be able to walk or bike to all three area schools (elementary, middle and high school). We chose our home based on the good-sized lot with a large enough backyard for family and neighborhood gatherings and it has gotten great use over the past 16 years. We chose to live in Kirkland, a suburb, because we’d have the conveniences of an urban core nearby without the nuisances (to us) that come from living within an urban core.

The Morgan proposal, to allow high density, commercial properties to be built within our residential neighborhood, feels like an encroachment of the urban core into our already-established residential area. We are glad to see the city is also opposed to extending the commercial boundaries outside of the existing ones at this site - we agree this would alter the neighborhood unnecessarily. Our preference would be to keep commercial/residential mixed use for the already under-developed commercial areas in the South Rose Hill/North Rose Hill neighborhoods - both within walking distance from the new rapid transit center and the many amenities 85th Street businesses offer.

It is our understanding that the Petco shopping plaza on 122nd Avenue NE and 85th Street is slated for this type of building - high density residential/commercial mixed use. Has any consideration been given to the properties north of the current plaza? It would seem to me that a redevelopment of that entire area - 85th to 90th with mixed use/high-to-medium density/multifamily/middle housing - would be more desirable than moving high density/mixed use/multifamily to an already established residential space.

The same might be considered for the Mercury Coffee shopping plaza on the east side of 122nd Avenue between 85th and 90th Streets. Walkability to shops, restaurants and other amenities. Easy access to the freeway and rapid transit, walkability to local schools and churches, etc. Or the Honda dealership lot on 85th Street and 124th Ave NE. Could these properties, which meet the goals of the Council and Planning Commission, be better alternatives?

If the Morgan properties are rezoned, we’d be in favor of medium density (no more than 12 units per acre, as we understand it) multi-family development. Duplex or triplex configuration, we think could work well in this area - it still gives the look and feel of single family residential, which aligns well with the rest of the street and with 2 of the 4 properties on that site that are already zoned as such. It would solve for additional housing; walkway access from this
development through to 120th and on to the rapid transit center could be part of the development; and an increase in traffic and parking (already an issue on 122nd) wouldn't be as overwhelming for our current infrastructure as a high-density development would be. Having said that, any additional development of multi-family housing would require better parking and speed enforcement on our street. Speed enforcement will also help encourage walking within the neighborhood core.

In addition to the Morgan proposal, our property is flanked by a similar proposal in the expanded study area along 124th Avenue NE. We would be in favor of rezoning for multi-family dwellings similar to what we've described above (multiplexes) to solve for the problems previously mentioned in this note. We also believe that if our neighbors are in favor of making changes to the zoning of their properties, they should be allowed to pursue this, however it our preference that our property be omitted from the study. It is our intention to continue raising our three children in our home in South Rose Hill.

In short, we are in favor of new housing options for our growing community and understand the importance of accessibility to public transportation and walkable communities. We also know our community already offers this to its current residents, albeit we could use some improvements. We are not in favor of high-density, commercial (urban core) development within our suburban communities and established neighborhoods, but would instead like to see more mixed use along the current commercial corridors that meet the same goals of walkability, easy access, etc. Lastly, when it comes to our home and land, we are opposed to rezoning at this time and would ask that we be left out of the expanded study suggesting instead the planning commission look at alternative locations that also meet their goals.

Thank you for your consideration,

~Jon and Laurie Boyd
8232 122nd Avenue NE
September 12, 2018

Attention: Ms. Janice Coogan and Kirkland Planning Commission Members

Dear Planning Commission Members,

Reference: Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan – Opposition to Rezone (Upzone) of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center Properties

I am writing to express opposition to the proposed change in land use and zoning to increase building height beyond the current 3 story height limit (proposal is 60') and to almost double the number of proposed housing units to be permitted in the Bridle Trails Shopping Center located SW of the intersection of NE 70th and 132nd Ave NE. I live across the street (east) from the shopping center and in the winter can see the Bartells sign out my living room window. I have attached a photo from our driveway toward the shopping center.

As a good citizen, I participated in the first neighborhood visioning meeting at Lake Washington Technical College. The meeting was very well attended with at least a dozen full tables represented. The goals of everyone in attendance appeared to be very consistent - a modest density increase for some portions of the overall area and to continue the general feel of the area, which is treed, quiet and focused around Bridle Trails Park (Park), a forested recreational area south of the subject parcels. One person present was in favor of high rise developments out of 100+ people in attendance. I left the meeting feeling comfortable that the city planners got the message as to what the residents of the area want.

The next thing I know, I received a mailer (thank you for the outreach) saying that there is a proposal to put a 6-story development essentially next to our property, and our previously platted 53 unit development of Bridle View, where all properties are over ¼ acre in size. As you know, this general area is where Bellevue, Redmond, and Kirkland all come together. South of the Park is low density residential developed plats (Bellevue). East of the park and subject property is low density residential property (Kirkland and Redmond). At the intersection itself on the north two sides are 2 story businesses that serve the community with some residential space above, and they have been successfully developed. There are two multi family developments immediately adjacent (south and west) to the subject parcels but they are the only multi family units in the vicinity.

My objections to this proposed zoning and land use change are as follows:

Neighborhood Compatibility:

I tried to think of a low density residential area that has an isolated set of 6 story buildings next to it and couldn’t come up with one. It would be very out of place and inconsistent with the neighborhood. We understand the need for additional housing and the current zoning allows for a huge number (almost 600) of additional residential units on the subject properties, so change is not needed to accommodate approximately 2000 additional residents to our community.
September 12, 2018
Ms. Janice Coogan and Kirkland Planning Commission Members
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Reference: Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan – Opposition to Rezone (Upzone) of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center Properties

Traffic:
The traffic is already jammed in this area and backed up significantly (many blocks) during rush hours in the morning and evening. This is before you add additional people to the mix. It takes a while in the morning and evening to get out of our neighborhood because there is no traffic signal. The already permitted development potential will increase this traffic significantly, and further density as proposed will be that much worse.

I suggest that a traffic study be performed to understand the current condition and the impacts of current and proposed zoning if this rezone proposal is not rejected at the planning commission meeting. This is not a transit hub where large developments might be appropriate without extremely significant impact to the community.

Parking:
When Red Apple Grocery was open, on weekends and evenings, it was hard to find a place to park in the parking lot. With the addition of a huge number of additional people, where will they park? Contrary to wishful thinking, they will not all take the bus, we have one bus line on 70th. I am opposed to a reduction in the standard number of parking stalls/unit for this development, as this is not an employment hub and people will still need to drive to work, for most jobs. I fear that the overflow will end up parking in our neighborhood, reducing the availability for resident and guest parking.

Light Pollution/Privacy:
As I mentioned, in the winter, we can see the Bartells sign out our living room window. Many more structures/stories/lights on will increase the light pollution in the neighborhood and allow many more people to be able to see into our house from across the street. This is not appropriate.

Noise:
The area we live in is currently very quiet. Many horses (who are spooked by noise) and animals/wildlife live here in addition to people. Coyotes are commonly seen walking down the road, and many other animals go to/from the park in the current condition. Adding the number of units in the proposed zoning change would significantly increase the noise level which would impact the wildlife in addition to a decreased quality of life for our neighborhood. Under no circumstances should any rooftop business be permitted. Decibel level should be restricted coming from any development, and doubling the number of permitted units will make noise much worse from cars, voices, music, etc.

Safety:
More traffic through the neighborhood in search of parking or a shortcut increases the likelihood of vehicle, pedestrian and domestic and wild animal collisions/injuries.
September 12, 2018
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Reference: Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan – Opposition to Rezone (Upzone) of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center Properties

Storm water:

Low elevation portions of our neighborhood flood (I’ve seen 5-inches of standing water in the street) during significant storms and I know some people in the public works department are aware of this issue. This impacts adjacent neighborhoods as well. Stormwater detention from any potential development should be made to significantly reduce the impact to the downstream neighborhoods and preferably use green storm water/low impact development methods of disposal.

Cost Effective Development:

I have heard an argument from someone that development to 3 stories and almost 600 units as currently zoned is not financially feasible. This is false. Many 2 and 3 story developments are successfully developed in Bellevue, Redmond and Kirkland (some infill of 2 and 3 stories on 70th have recently been constructed). Any development on that parcel with almost 600 currently zoned units, with nice condominium prices typical of the area costing $600,000 would yield over $350,000,000 without the other income from businesses. This is before any rezone is contemplated. There are infrastructure improvements that will be required and building construction also costs money but there is huge potential for profit and income as currently zoned.

In conclusion, my neighbors and I hope that the Kirkland planning commission and City Council members consider the fit with the neighborhood over the financial interests of 2 or 3 property owners in considering the upzone/rezone request and not allow an isolated small area of 6 story buildings in an otherwise much less densely developed area. The CURRENT zoning already allows for significant development potential, should the owners be so inclined.

Thank you for your consideration.

Regards,

Laurie Fulton

Phone: 206 550 0380
Laurie.davidf@frontier.com

Attachment:
c. City Council Members
Planning Commissioners –

The following email from Lake Washington Institute of Technology responds to the question asked by the PC at your study session on July 26, when all requests for land use change/rezones and code amendment were introduced, regarding housing at the campus.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
Senior Planner
Kirkland Planning & Building Department
425-587-3254
jbrill@kirklandwa.gov
Mon – Thu

Joan, the position of Lake Washington Institute of Technology regarding potential housing on campus remains the same as we outlined in the attached letter. This is only under consideration at this point by the College and would be part of a longer term facilities plan. There are no immediate short-term plans by the College for housing on campus nor an immediate request by the College to change zoning regulations. While our long term plans for housing would be primarily intended to address housing for our employees and students, there could be consideration given to others depending on partnerships and funding. But, at this early point, Lake Washington recognizes that any effort for housing on campus is going to require a significant number of years and funding support not currently available by the College.

I hope this helps clarify the College’s thoughts on housing on our campus. Please let me know if you have any questions.

Thank you.

Bill Thomas
Vice President, Administrative Services
Lake Washington Institute of Technology
From: Joan Lieberman-Brill  
Sent: Tuesday, August 21, 2018 10:33 AM  
To: 'amy.goings@lwtech.edu'  
Subject: LWIT Request for Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan policy change

HI Amy,

The update of the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan is moving forward with a Planning Commission meeting scheduled for September 13 on the land use/rezone/zoning regulation or policy change requests initiated by stakeholders or staff proposals, in order to provide a preliminary recommendation on which ones move forward to public hearing in October. These requests were introduced to the Planning Commission in July. I’m not sure if you have been following this update – here is a link to the Planning Commission website to view the staff memo that was considered at the July 26 Planning Commission study session when all requests were introduced, along with the first draft of the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails Plans. Scroll down to “Meeting Information” for July 26 and you may download the meeting packet Part 1, 2, and 3.

At that study session they provided feedback and had a few questions on the requested changes and draft Rose Hill and Bridle Trails plans. Regarding LWIT, they asked for more information about your interest in providing student or staff housing. They wondered generally if there could be any way to restrict tenants to students or staff, which is a question planning staff may explore. In the meantime it would be helpful to confirm if your intention is to limit housing only to those who either attend or work at LWIT and their families. Please respond by August 28 so I can respond to the Planning Commission in a staff memo I’m preparing for the September 13 meeting.

I would also encourage you to attend the upcoming September 13 meeting to follow the discussion on your amendment request. The meeting will begin at 7:00 PM and is held in the Council Chamber at City Hall. If it isn’t possible to attend, you can view the meeting live by going to the Planning Commission Meetings Online website. The staff memorandum that will be considered by the Planning Commission will be available for viewing on September 7, the Friday prior to the meeting, by following this link to the Planning Commission website and scrolling down to "Meeting Information" for that date.

Please let me know if you have questions.

Sincerely,

Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP  
Senior Planner  
Kirkland Planning & Building Department  
425-587-3254  
jbrill@kirklandwa.gov  
Mon – Thus
Greetings to Kirkland Planning Commissioners and Planners: Thanks for all you do. My name/address is Lyle Matznick 6627 134th Ave NE, Kirkland, WA 98033. I live in the Bridle View community directly east (across 132nd Ave NE) of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center. I have lived there for over 45 years (moved in before BTSC existed!). I have enjoyed shopping at BTSC stores/shops/... since their very beginning (I walk there more often than drive there). Recently it was a sad day/time when the Red Apple grocery store (a true friendly neighborhood gathering place) was forced to close because the property owner raised the rent way too much. Now we have a “second rate” grocery store in its place ...UGH!

GREED/GREED/GREED ... MORE profit/MORE profit/MORE profit is what this requested re-zone is all about. More the 20 commercial establishment already exist in BTSC and current zoning allows for almost 600 housing units. I know there is a demand for more housing and I would welcome these new neighbors. BUT ... I disagree with up-zoning to put more money in the pockets of the property owner and potential developer.

On another matter ... a six story building would stick-out like a sore thumb ... ALWAYS ... FOREVER!

Please keep the zoning as it is. Thank you, Lyle (425) 869-0465
Hi Adam,

If a response is warranted, please respond within five days.

Thank you.

Jeannie McGivern
City Manager’s Office
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov
(425) 587-3016

Subscribe to This Week in Kirkland and receive brief, timely news and notices about City-sponsored events.

Tourism Website: www.explorekirkland.com
Tourism Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/explorekirkland

From: cr8tive [mailto:cr8tive@frontier.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 1:09 PM
To: City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>; Amy Walen <AWalen@kirklandwa.gov>; Amy Bolen <ABolen@kirklandwa.gov>; Dave Asher <DAsher@kirklandwa.gov>; Jay Arnold <JArnold@kirklandwa.gov>; Jon Pascal <JPascal@kirklandwa.gov>; Penny Sweet <PSweet@kirklandwa.gov>; Tom Neir <TNeir@kirklandwa.gov>; Toby Nixon <TNixon@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Continental Divide Mixed Project

Dear Kirkland City Council Members,

I live at 8534 131st AVE NE, which borders the subject property for the Continental Divide Mixed Use project. I have serious concerns about the process that led to this project and I request your help in mitigating the detrimental effects of this project before it is built. This same process is happening again as the Planning Commission is making the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for our neighborhood (Rose Hill/Bridle Trails) and hopes to wrap it up by the end of 2018. I believe the notification process does not reach enough people and the methods of publicizing the plan are unfair and insufficient. Please review
the notification standards the Planning Commission must use to notify the public.

Currently the City of Kirkland does the following to notify the community about rezone proposals:

- Posting notice on public notice sign boards surrounding the rezone property, on all adjacent streets
- Posting notice on the City’s website
- Publishing notice in the Seattle Times
- Posting notice on official notification boards at City Hall

Please consider adding the following:

- On plan maps, especially those shown to the public, use an **ACCURATE** definition to better reflect the code description. As in the Continental Divide project, the term "office" in the legend was **deceptive and misleading**. I suggest mixed-use, mixed-use high-density residential, or commercial high-density residential.
- Guarantee notification of neighbors bordering the property under consideration.
- Notify the community sooner and multiple times to make sure new residents are notified. I suggest every 6 months.
- Notify by mail. Small signs posted at busy intersections are insufficient.
- Notify a larger radius around proposed rezoning areas. Redmond and Bellevue send notifications to a 500 ft radius, while Kirkland sends to just a 300 ft radius.
- Notify all impacted parties regardless of distance if the radius encompasses some of the residents that live on a sole access point, i.e. Residents on a dead-end street or development that has only one access point. Only some of the residents in The Pointe and on 131st were notified even thought this will significantly impact all residents in these neighborhoods.
- Add a public notice sign to each lot on which a building will be developed. One sign in front of three lots makes it seem as if only one will be developed.
- Public notice signs and **information needs to be updated with new dates and next steps information after each meeting**. Currently, the Continental Divide signs state the July 2 mtg. If residents were to look at this notice, they would think they missed the deadline even though the process is still under review.
- Put the sign in a conspicuous location when the property is a large lot. i.e. The notification sign on the east side of the Petco property is located past the driveway to the north. Very little traffic drives past this sign location. It should have been located to the south of the east driveway to attract attention. It seems like the plan is to attract as little attention as possible when sign placement is decided.

Specifically about the Continental Divide Project, I have concerns about the severe change this project could mean to our neighborhood. The developer has a building permit but the design has not been approved. **Please do all that is within the Kirkland City Council’s power to address my concerns before the Design Review Board approves the design on September 17th.**

Violations of zoning codes and the Comprehensive Plan:

- The description of the project states it is “a four story mixed use building” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan limits buildings to three stories by stating, “providing incentives including increased building
heights up to three stories” (Policy NE85-4.8). This project cannot have four stories if the limit is three stories. If there is a conflict between zoning codes the most restrictive of these apply (KZC 170.50).

- This project includes residential units on the ground floor, but the Zone Use Chart for the zone where this project is located (RH-8) states that stacked dwelling units “may not be located on the ground floor of a structure” (KZC 53.84 Zone RH8 Use Zone Chart .050 Stacked Dwelling Units). This violation should not be ignored and no exceptions should be granted.

- The description of the project states, “A single story commercial building will be located near NE 85th Street” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan prohibits such buildings by stating, “Discourage single story retail buildings” (Policy NE85-4.8).

Notice to the community: I believe the notice given by the City of Kirkland was insufficient. Kirkland notifies too late in the process and notifies fewer neighbors than other nearby cities. Maps and notices use the misleading term “Office” for businesses and/or high-density apartments. In very late June 2018, a public notice sign went up at the corner of 85th/Redmond Way and 132nd Ave NE and we received a notice about a July 2nd Design Review Meeting. This was the very first time I heard about this project. There were no other notices sent since December 2015 (two-and-a-half years). The notices sent in December 2015 were from an old list that wasn’t updated to include homeowners who bought homes directly adjacent to the project in the previous six months. Even still, none of longtime homeowners who lived within 300 feet of this project knew about the changes that would so severely impact their properties. Please consider overhauling the entire process for notifying the community about zoning, public comment periods, and public meetings.

Jarring transition between houses and huge complex: If this project is approved as-is a towering wall of over 200 windows and balconies will overlook single-family homes, leaving some homes in shadow all winter. This horseshoe-shaped project has adjoining walls between residential units and commercial spaces. These both violate the city’s land use policy to “create effective transitions between commercial areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods” (Policy LU-5.1 Urban Design).

Safety: Bicyclists, joggers, and walkers could be endangered by the busy garage entrances. One of these garage entrances is next to a school bus stop and along schoolchildren’s walking routes. Current neighbors on dead-end 131st and along 132nd already have trouble accessing their homes and this project adds busy driveways to both streets. The nearby megachurch traffic already requires a police officer to direct Sunday traffic at the intersection for this project.

Gateway feature: Much Design Review Committee time has been spend on adjusting the look and feel of the 85th/132nd corner. The city wants to encourage pedestrians and spending time in the gateway seating area of this project, however it is unsafe and will not be a popular place to sit and visit. The gateway design is to close to the intersection and doesn’t include pedestrian protection from the passing vehicles, which endangers any children who are in the gateway area. We do not want to repeat the deadly accident that happened at a seating area at Redmond Town Center a few years back. This is not a destination for a leisurely cup of coffee and chatting with friends because it’s too close to the road, vehicles race by, semis loudly switch gears at the crest of the hill, and you will be breathing exhaust.

Less parking than required: The developer claims their parking spaces will be used by businesses during the day and as guest parking at night, however dual use parking spaces not allowed by code. Surrounding streets have almost no street parking and new fire hydrants required because of this project mean even less parking. More parked cars on narrow 131st means less emergency access. On a given day 5-10 vehicles are parked on 131st from local businesses, often blocking trash pickup and mail delivery. Often there is one way access due to cars on both sides of the road. I can’t imagine how many extra vehicles will be in front of our homes with 134 apartment units.

Family atmosphere: I am concerned about the family-oriented neighborhood we have now changing into
big apartment complexes with studio apartments. New residents in this project will find themselves in an area with minimal bus service, very few businesses catering to them, and a steep hill bordered by forested ravines. The pedestrians in our neighborhood tend to be neighbors walking their dogs, retirees on a walk, limited commuters taking the bus, and children going to and from school. I’m concerned that the young people attracted to this complex are not going to find the convenient amenities they want and 134 units of new people will change the character of our residential area. **The projects is not increasing services that will enhance the neighborhood and increase the walkability of the community, since there is no restaurant or gathering place proposed due to the lack of a grease trap in the plan. This was a misleading selling point!**

Garbage collection: The dumpster for entire building is collected next to **MY one-story home creating a great deal of noise and blocking my access to leave and enter my home.** When the garbage truck backs up into the driveway for collection, it will block access to one of only two entrances for the whole apartment complex. That seems inconvenient and even dangerous for that many people to be down to one entrance.

No moving truck loading zone: Studio apartments are for young people whose lives are ever-changing. This project has no loading zone for a moving truck. Just as with garbage collection, if a moving truck blocks either driveway, residents are down to one way in or out. If moving trucks choose to stop on 132nd, they will be impacting an already clogged intersection. If the moving truck parks on 131st, it will impact a dead-end street already overwhelmed by nearby businesses using their street to park.

No play area or open spaces for children: Children who live in this apartment complex will have no options for playing outside. The nearest public park is a 13-minute 0.7 mile walk almost entirely along busy 85th Street. The current proposal for this apartment complex doesn’t include any playground equipment or even an open grassy area for children. The center courtyard will be a parking lot, which cannot be safe a play area. The city’s plan for adequate access to play areas/parks would not be met with a development of this size at this location.

Businesses that the community will frequent: With just 7% of the square footage for businesses, this project can just barely be considered mixed use. The developer’s plan is to use the retail space for their own corporate office and a property management company, leaving one space for a business that the community may actually use. **Again, misleading to the community that didn’t oppose rezone in favor of walkable destination that enhances the community.**

Quality of life: Only because of neighborhood outcry, the city wrote an FAQ document about this project. In response to our concerns about our quality of life, the city replied, “The City does not have a metric for quality of life.” The developer has no incentive to preserve our quality of life and the city says there is no metric for it. **My neighbors and I are on the cusp of losing the quality of life in our neighborhood. It will come in the form of towering walls of windows, noisy apartments, busy driveways choking gridlocked intersections, loss of solar access all winter, children with nowhere to play, moving trucks and garbage trucks blocking roads, and so many people crammed into a once-quiet neighborhood. All of this on streets lined with modest houses and homeowners who were not given the chance to prevent it.**

I am seeking the following solutions and intervention on the City Council’s part:

- **This development should NOT be granted a permit.** The development needs to decrease the size to three stories and replace residential units with retail on the ground floor, **per the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan.**

- **The upcoming Design Review Board meeting on September 17th should be CANCELLED,** because the developer has not complied with zoning code and the Design Review Board should not approve a design that violates zoning code.

- Please re-examine the unlimited density in the RH-8 zone abutting residential. **Adjust it to reflect the**
neighborhood plan and land use goals that are part of the comprehensive plan.

- In December 2015, the developer used a Citizen Amendment Request to change 6 parcels that were zoned residential to "Office." This is a misleading term because it did not communicate the possibility of high-density residential units next to single family homes. **This project should be limited to OFFICE to match the description.** In the future, the zoning code description should reflect the term “office” or terms like “High-density Residential” and “Mixed Use” should be used so the community is not misled again.

- **Please completely overhaul and modernize the notification process.** The current process relies on community members being highly involved in local government through reading newspapers, reading city newsletters, visiting city websites, subscribing to city update email lists, and even physically visiting city hall to read notice boards.

Please do not set a precedent by allowing this huge, out-of-place development in our neighborhood that clearly **CONFLICTS with Kirkland’s zoning codes and Comprehensive Plan.** Please do what is in the power of the Kirkland City Council to help our neighborhood keep its current **family atmosphere,** the traffic flow of those passing through, the safety of our children, and our quality of life. We are counting on you to hear us and make the vital changes necessary before the Continental Divide project is built.

Sincerely,

Lynn Armstrong

8534 131st AVE NE
Kirkland, WA 98033

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
I am writing in support of the potential Bridle Trails shopping center rezone. We need the rezone in order to encourage development that will help meet neighborhood and city goals. We have seen from Houghton and developer feedback for Bridle Trails that redevelopment won’t happen with 30 foot limits.

We recently lost the Red Apple Market and now have much a lower quality option. The entire region is growing, and we live in a very desirable area, so housing demand is significantly up. Since the entire Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill area has essentially retained the same zoning - and therefore the same housing supply - this has led to large demographic changes in the neighborhood. This has led to the large number of teardowns and, according to the Red Apple owners, less demand for a neighborhood grocery store. Having more people increases our chances of having higher quality retail in our shopping area, and it is likely that the demographics of the residents in such a development would support that as well.

Several years ago, we lost Metro route 265 and its direct service to Seattle. We are rather fortunate with our current population to currently have the 245 with its 15-minute service. The 245 is unlikely to go away, but there will be increasing pressure to serve other areas. To maintain, or hopefully improve, its service level, we need more riders.

The region’s growth has led to an incredible housing shortage, marked by huge increases in living costs and sprawled development to the north, east, and south. This has been forced by a lack of housing across the region, starting with Seattle but also including places like Houghton and our neighborhood. **Kirkland's desire to be a welcoming and inclusive community is effectively blocked by a lack of housing options.** We are losing police officers because they can’t live nearby. Teachers are forced to live far away, and so on. Despite developments such as Kirkland Urban and Totem Lake, Kirkland lags behind most of the region. Not only is there an Affordable Housing shortage, but there is a lack of affordable housing even for the middle class. I’m constantly talking to people that I would love to have as neighbors who are turned away by Kirkland’s market. This rezone is one way that we can both contribute to solving this problem as well as strengthen our community.

The main concern with development is the effect on traffic. However, the status quo, both locally and in the region, is the major contributor to traffic. 70th and 132nd are alternate routes for commutes such as Microsoft to north Kirkland, Bothell, and even beyond. A main cause of traffic is people living far from their destinations in car-dependent areas. Many of the people who can't live in our neighborhood center will be the ones driving down 70th. Grocery Outlet's business model is dependent on people from a wide area making multiple stops to do their grocery shopping. We have traffic because we've forced it on ourselves. New development, of course, isn’t a magic solution that makes that traffic go away, but local traffic does tend to displace cut-through traffic, and **having more people that are closer together enables more options such as walking, biking, and transit**, which give us alternatives to being stuck in traffic.
It is an odd thing that we have these shortages while the current 2-3 story zoned potential sits unused. Feedback from developers seems to indicate that the costs of construction generally don't work out at this height, which is why we don't see so many mixed-use 3-story buildings and haven't seen any activity on the Houghton parcels. This is especially true when we make demands for large retail spaces (like that needed for a grocery store), community space, infrastructure improvements, and so on. These are good things, and they can be worth including in a plan, but they can't happen unless the overall project is worth doing.

I do not think that “equestrian character” should be a factor in the zoning process. My family is one of the few (only 10% of large lots by informal counts) that actually own horses anymore, and we would still be able to do so with this redevelopment. Market forces have turned the overall neighborhood into luxury large-lot housing, with remodels/reconstruction making some lots unusable for equestrian purposes. Obviously we like our situation, but prioritizing a handful of horses over 1,100 housing units is the wrong priority for an inclusive community.

Mark Plesko
Bridle Trails
I am vehemently opposed to the rezoning proposal for the Morgan property and the extended area. I fail to see why the construction of a rapid transit station necessitates this rezoning. It would be better to create more parking space near the new rapid transit station.
NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
From: Matt Moats [mailto:moatsmjl@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 05, 2018 9:07 PM
To: PlanningInfo
Subject: fraudulent zoning request

To whom it may concern,

reference: https://www.kirklandwa.gov/Assets/Planning/Planning+PDFs/Planning+Commission/North_South+Rose+Hill+-+Bridle+Trails+Neighborhood+Plan+Update+PC+Meeting+Packet+7_26_18+-+CAM18-00082+WEB_Part2.pdf

It appears the neighbors of Sharon Velozo have attempted to get her property rezoned by indicating ownership of her plot of land.

The proposal written states:
"4 lots owned by morgans"
one of the properties listed is 8245 122nd ave ne. This property is owned by Sharon Velozo.

Ms. Velozo was never consulted in this, and does not wish to rezone the property. The morgans have been consulting developers from the area, and this is yet another attempt to profit off the surrounding properties.

We request that the proposal be audited for validity and if invalid, revoked. You can find Sharon Velozo's property listed under parcel pin 1233100271

-Matthew Moats
Dear Planning Commissioners,

My name is Mayerber Carvalho Neto, owner of a unit at Overlook Village condos on 118TH CT NE.

I'm writing you to express concern about Lee Johnson's expansion proposal. Our community shares a fence with Lee Johnson. I'm particularly concerned about increased density and traffic due to this proposal.

We will be feeling the effects of the New Bethlehem Project's permanent shelter when it opens as our community too shares a fence with that location.

Sincerely,
Mayerber and Paulina Carvalho
8010 118th CT NE
Bridle Trails is the last bastion of a safe place to ride anywhere near Seattle. 15 years ago my husband, daughter and I moved to Kirkland to enjoy a very special, and hard-earned opportunity to live near Seattle, work, and have horses at our house. We are a two-person working family... As it is, increasing traffic on 132nd can be treacherous to riding horses to the park. Increasing density will make it even more so.

We do not want to be driven from our home because density creates more traffic, which makes it unsafe to ride in the area.

I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

Please consider having folks build somewhere else – not in the heart of a one-of-a-kind equestrian neighborhood and destroying something that can never be repaired.

Megan Davidson
Commercial Insurance
Sales Executive
Commercial Insurance
601 Union Street, Suite 3400
Seattle, WA 98101-1371
206.262.4375 Direct
206.954.0950 Mobile

Unrelentingly Unconventional

Propel's offices will close at noon on Fridays during the summer starting May 25th.

NOTICE: This communication including any attachments may contain privileged or confidential information. If you are not the intended recipient, or believe that you received this communication in error, please advise the sender immediately and delete or destroy the communication you received without copying or disclosing the contents. Thank you.
“I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. The traffic is already bad enough. We can not even get out of our neighborhood or get to our house during rush hours. It used to be only 116th Ave NE was backed up but now 132nd Ave NE is backed up for miles from Bellevue to Bridle View, where I live. Also 70th place is already very busy during mornings and afternoons due to Microsoft and folks working in Redmond. This change will make this area impossible to get in and out. Please please reconsider this zoning change.

Thank you very much,
Mehri Kaufman
Hi Adam,

If a response is warranted, please respond within five business days.

Thank you.

Jeannie McGivern
City Manager’s Office
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov
(425) 587-3016

Subscribe to This Week in Kirkland and receive brief, timely news and notices about City-sponsored events.

Tourism Website: www.explorefirkland.com
Tourism Facebook Page: www.facebook.com/explorefirkland

From: Mehri Kaufman [mailto:nursemehri@gmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 2:53 PM
To: City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Rezone - Bridle Trail Shopping center

Dear Councilmen,

I object to Policy BT-7 in the draft Bridle Trails Comprehensive Plan which encourages the increase in height of the Bridle Trails shopping center. Please delete the words in this policy ...“with an increase of height to 5-6 stories.” The current zoning serves our rural, equestrian oriented neighborhood. Any height increase is not necessary and will not be supported by the residents. This will impact the traffic tremendously. It's already pretty backed up due to the increase of housing in Kirkland and Redmond.
Please consider our opinions in your decisions,
Thank you so much,
Mehri Kaufman (Bridle View resident)

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello, my name is Melissa Cook and I live in the Bridleview neighborhood, across the street from the Bridle Trails Shopping Center. I previously lived in Bridlewood Circle for 20 years so I have lived nearby the shopping center and used it since 1990.

I do not support raising the current height restrictions at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 to 65 feet, allowing up to 5 or 6 stores as currently proposed. I believe that would significantly change the nature of this equestrian and park-like rural neighborhood and dramatically increase traffic and noise in the area.

However, I am supportive of allowing 2 stories in the shopping center, which would enable more local shopping or housing choices.

Sincerely,

Melissa Cook
6322 133rd Ave NE
Kirkland WA 98033
425-985-9142
Hi Janice-
I am a resident in the Bridle Trails Neighborhood (on 128th Ave NE) and was recently made aware of the Neighborhood Plan updates. I read through the First Draft - Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan and was sent a link to the Neighborhood Plan Update Meeting Packet from 7/26/2018 and would like to provide the following comments:

In general, I would like to see LESS development. The character of the Bridle Trails neighborhood is based on the equestrian focused, larger lots that give the neighborhood a more rural feel while still living in a city. We have lived in Bridle Trails for nine years now and part of the calculus in choosing this neighborhood was the above mentioned character. We paid a premium to live in this type of a neighborhood and the rural feel that attracted us here is fading as more development is being allowed--and once development is allowed, it cannot be undone and returned to its historical roots and character. In addition, our streets and schools are already overcrowded and minimal effort is being made to alleviate these problems. Traffic on 70th Street has gotten progressively more congested since we moved here. It used to take only a few seconds to turn onto 70th Street and now it takes many minutes to catch a small break in traffic before we can even exit our neighborhood. Due to this increase in traffic, I no longer feel safe allowing my children to play in our front yard without vigilant supervision because of the speed and amount of cars traveling down our small neighborhood access street. My desires for LESS development holds true for the Rose Hill Neighborhoods as well, but since I do not reside in those neighborhoods, I will contain my comments to only Bridle Trails.

My specific comments to the Meeting Packet and Draft Neighborhood Plan are below:

Comments on the Meeting Packet
1. Item # 8 Applicant: Daniel Weise
I agree with the City's preliminary staff recommendation to NOT change the existing land use. This request contradicts Policy BT 1 in the neighborhood plan to maintain the equestrian neighborhood.

2. Item # 9 Applicant: Bridle Trails Shopping Center
-I do not agree with allowing an increase in building height at the Shopping Center. The neighborhood and streets are crowded enough. Allowing higher density would just aggravate the problem. This is supposed to be an equestrian oriented neighborhood with a small commercial shopping center, not a tall downtown style mixed use building.
-Residences should not be allowed on the ground floor. This center is a small NEIGHBORHOOD shopping center and should not be filled full of residential units, it should have the standard convenient businesses that for the most part currently occupy the center (grocery, drug store, hardware, gym...) and not be filled with more residences--especially on the ground floor.
-I did not have access to the written request for the flexibility in parking standards, but Im assuming the builder is asking for a variance to provide less (or smaller) parking spaces than usually required. This is also something the City should not approve. While the dream of providing a walkable neighborhood shopping center that doesn't require much parking sound lovely, its not practical. There are plenty of people that live in the Bridle Trails Neighborhood that use the shopping center where it is not practical for them to walk to the grocery store.
Ample, convenient, and appropriately sized parking spaces need to be provided at the redeveloped center.

Comments/Questions on the Draft Neighborhood Plan
3. Policy BT 1, 2 and 5: Can you elaborate what is meant by compact housing opportunities and clustered cottages? How can the existing pattern of equestrian-oriented open space be retained if the open space is going to be occupied with clustered cottages and compact housing?

4. Policy BT 5: How close to the Shopping Center are the incentivized missing middle homes being proposed? There are already apartment complexes surrounding the Shopping Center. Is the proposal to increase this "incentivizing area" beyond the existing apartment complexes? Again, how do you maintain the equestrian character of the neighborhood by incentivizing MORE development. The largest part of what gives the neighborhood the equestrian character is the larger lots which allow for more open space and provides a more rural feel, even areas close to the shopping center.

5. Policy BT 7 "Actively promote the redevelopment of the Bridle Trails shopping center into an active, walkable, transit-supportive mixed use neighborhood center, including affordable housing" - I disagree with this policy as written. I do not believe that redevelopment of the center should be "actively promoted", it currently provides the core business types that the residents of this neighborhood need. Since apartments/condos will be the housing built at the center, how much more affordable do you need to require??

Thank you for the opportunity to provide comments and ask questions. If you have any follow up questions feel free to email me.

Michelle Claassen
Email received 9-12-2018

Joan, Janice, here are my comments on the proposed changes, as requested.

Best,

Michelle Plesko
Michelle.plesko@outlook.com

85th: The 85th Street corridor could be a real neighborhood if we let it. There's no reason that density needs to decrease as we move East. This is still a valuable location and desirable neighborhood. We can give more opportunities for people to live there and for businesses to serve the community. Even at the east end it should be at least neighborhood center level of density, and pedestrian-friendly. No parking lots fronting the street.

LWIT housing: Market-rate housing is entirely reasonable for this site. Building on the surface parking lots is also reasonable (and the parking should not be replaced). This is an opportunity to connect through the LWIT site, currently a barrier, especially to those on foot. There should be a connection to the Rose Hill Greenway from whatever housing is built there.

Lee Johnson site: should absolutely be something else. Right now it's a crater in the walkshed of the transit station. We need to consider parking requirements for this site. If there is too much parking, there will be too many cars trying to access the site - terrible for those walking or biking to transit station.

Bridle Trails shopping center: I support 6 stories of mixed-use pedestrian-oriented development and minimal developer requirements. Why? Because we have a housing shortage. 1000 units will not solve it, but we need many 1000 unit developments to make a dent in the shortage.

We especially have a housing shortage in Bridle Trails. There are many people who would like to live in this great location but there isn't space for them. It shouldn't be necessary to buy a house to live here. Every unit we decline to build in Bridle Trails means another family commuting through our neighborhood from Bothell.

If we want retail, we need the people to support it. Going from Red Apple to Grocery Outlet was a disappointing downgrade. 1000 households living on top of the grocery store means it is more likely to survive.

We have a great bus route in the 245. The more people that live along the route, the more likely we are to keep it and its reasonable service.

If people are concerned about traffic, the best way to combat this is to provide less parking. There are studies that show that more parking leads to more traffic. Building housing in accessible locations such as Bridle Trails means that people have transportation options. Giving people transportation options means that they will contribute much less to the traffic than if they lived in Bothell.

Three-story mixed use developments are nonexistent or disappointing. None of spaces in Kirkland that are zoned 3-story mixed use have been built. Early in the recent Houghton process, BERK consultants
concluded that 3-stories is unlikely to be built, and if it is, it will have a large surface parking lot - not what we usually have in mind for mixed-use. Lake Hills Shopping Center is an interesting cautionary tale: their new 3-story mixed-use development is an underperforming strip mall with a large surface parking lot, and a set of 3-story apartments. Also not what we have in mind. If we want appealing redevelopment, we need to give the developer more flexibility.

I also support the six stories as requested because there will be a battle in the neighborhood either way, and whatever is designed will get whittled down in Design Review. So let's give them enough to start with.

**Jin proposal:** is walking distance to many amenities. There should not be single family housing this close to this many amenities. It is way too valuable for that. If not rezoned for commercial, it should be rezoned to denser residential. If it's not rezoned, it will be redeveloped to larger newer more expensive single family housing and we'll lose the opportunity. We've seen this all over the city, and particularly in South Rose Hill and Bridle Trails.

**Daniel weise:** rezoning RSX 35 to RSX 7.2 does not add anything useful to the neighborhood. We can easily add that number of units by rezoning something closer to amenities.
I support increased height limits and mixed-use zoning at the Bridle Trails shopping center. This is because I like having businesses within walking distance, and we are more likely to retain them if there are more people in the neighborhood. I also believe that people of all incomes should have the opportunity to live in this neighborhood, near jobs and transit, and walking and biking distance to schools, churches and other daily needs. This is a neighborhood with transportation options, where one can live well with minimal driving.

I also support zoning for more housing within the 10-minute walkshed of the shopping center, particularly the apartment complexes nearby, and the single family zones across 70th.

Michelle Plesko
Bridle Trails
Dear Kirkland City Council Members,

My family lives in the house at 7012 116th ave NE which is near the subject property for the Continental Divide Mixed Use project. I have serious concerns about the process that led to this project and I request your help in mitigating the detrimental effects of this project before it is built. This same process is happening again as the Planning Commission is making the 20-year Comprehensive Plan for our neighborhood (Rose Hill/Bridle Trails) and hopes to wrap it up by the end of 2018. I believe the notification process does not reach enough people and the methods of publicizing the plan are unfair and insufficient. Please review the notification standards the Planning Commission must use to notify the public.

Currently the City of Kirkland does the following to notify the community about rezone proposals:

- Posting notice on public notice sign boards surrounding the rezone property, on all adjacent streets
- Posting notice on the City’s website
- Publishing notice in the Seattle Times
- Posting notice on official notification boards at City Hall

Please consider adding the following:

- On plan maps, especially those shown to the public, change the misleading term "office" in the legend to better reflect the code description. I suggest mixed-use, mixed-use high-density residential, or commercial high-density residential.
- Notify the community sooner and multiple times to make sure new residents are notified. I suggest every 6 months.
- Notify by mail. Small signs posted at busy intersections are insufficient.
- Notify a larger radius around proposed rezoning areas. Redmond and Bellevue send notifications to a 500 ft radius, while Kirkland sends to just a 300 ft radius.
• Add a public notice sign to each lot on which a building will be developed. One sign in front of three lots makes it seem as if only one will be developed.

Specifically about the Continental Divide Project, I have concerns about the severe change this project could mean to our neighborhood. The developer has a building permit but the design has not been approved. Please do all that is within the Kirkland City Council’s power to address my concerns before the Design Review Board approves the design on September 17th.

Violations of zoning codes and the Comprehensive Plan:

• The description of the project states it is “a four story mixed use building” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan limits buildings to three stories by stating, “providing incentives including increased building heights up to three stories” (Policy NE85-4.8). This project cannot have four stories if the limit is three stories. If there is a conflict between zoning codes the most restrictive of these apply (KZC 170.50).

• This project includes residential units on the ground floor, but the Zone Use Chart for the zone where this project is located (RH-8) states that stacked dwelling units “may not be located on the ground floor of a structure” (KZC 53.84 Zone RH8 Use Zone Chart .050 Stacked Dwelling Units). This violation should not be ignored and no exceptions should be granted.

• The description of the project states, “A single story commercial building will be located near NE 85th Street” however the NE 85th St Subarea Plan prohibits such buildings by stating, “Discourage single story retail buildings” (Policy NE85-4.8).

Notice to the community: I believe the notice given by the City of Kirkland was insufficient. Kirkland notifies too late in the process and notifies fewer neighbors than other nearby cities. Maps and notices use the misleading term "Office" for businesses and/or high-density apartments. In very late June 2018, a public notice sign went up at the corner of 85th/Redmond Way and 132nd Ave NE and we received a notice about a July 2nd Design Review Meeting. This was the very first time I heard about this project. There were no other notices sent since December 2015 (two-and-a-half years). The notices sent in December 2015 were from an old list that wasn’t updated to include homeowners who bought homes directly adjacent to the project in the previous six months. Even still, none of longtime homeowners who lived within 300 feet of this project knew about the changes that would so severely impact their properties. Please consider overhauling the entire process for notifying the community about zoning, public comment periods, and public meetings.

Jarring transition between houses and huge complex: If this project is approved as-is a towering wall of over 200 windows and balconies will overlook single-family homes, leaving some homes in shadow all winter. This horseshoe-shaped project has adjoining walls between residential units and commercial spaces. These both violate the city’s land use policy to “create effective transitions between commercial areas and surrounding residential neighborhoods” (Policy LU-5.1 Urban Design).
Safety: Bicyclists, joggers, and walkers could be endangered by the busy garage entrances. One of these garage entrances is next to a school bus stop and along schoolchildren’s walking routes. Current neighbors on dead-end 131st and along 132nd already have trouble accessing their homes and this project adds busy driveways to both streets. The nearby megachurch traffic already requires a police officer to direct Sunday traffic at the intersection for this project.

Less parking than required: The developer claims their parking spaces will be used by businesses during the day and as guest parking at night, however dual use parking spaces not allowed by code. Surrounding streets have almost no street parking and new fire hydrants required because of this project mean even less parking. More parked cars on narrow 131st means less emergency access.

Family atmosphere: I am concerned about the family-oriented neighborhood we have now changing into big apartment complexes with studio apartments. New residents in this project will find themselves in an area with minimal bus service, very few businesses catering to them, and a steep hill bordered by forested ravines. The pedestrians in our neighborhood tend to be neighbors walking their dogs, retirees on a walk, commuters taking the bus to Redmond, and children going to and from school. I’m concerned that the young people attracted to this complex are not going to find the convenient amenities they want and 134 units of new people will change the character of our residential area.

Garbage collection: The dumpster for entire building is collected next to a neighbor's one-story home. When the garbage truck backs up into the driveway for collection, it will block access to one of only two entrances for the whole apartment complex. That seems inconvenient and even dangerous for that many people to be down to one entrance.

No moving truck loading zone: Studio apartments are for young people whose lives are ever-changing. This project has no loading zone for a moving truck. Just as with garbage collection, if a moving truck blocks either driveway, residents are down to one way in or out. If moving trucks choose to stop on 132nd, they will be impacting an already clogged intersection. If the moving truck parks on 131st, it will impact a dead-end street already overwhelmed by nearby businesses using their street to park.

No play area or open spaces for children: Children who live in this apartment complex will have no options for playing outside. The nearest public park is a 13-minute 0.7 mile walk almost entirely along busy 85th Street. The current proposal for this apartment complex doesn't include any playground equipment or even an open grassy area for children. The center courtyard will be a parking lot, which cannot be safe a play area.

Businesses that the community will frequent: With just 7% of the square footage for businesses, this project can just barely be considered mixed use. The developer’s plan is to use the retail space for their own corporate office and a property management company, leaving one space for a business that the community may actually use.
Quality of life: Only because of neighborhood outcry, the city wrote an FAQ document about this project. In response to our concerns about our quality of life, the city replied, “The City does not have a metric for quality of life.” The developer has no incentive to preserve our quality of life and the city says there is no metric for it. My neighbors and I are on the cusp of losing the quality of life in our neighborhood. It will come in the form of towering walls of windows, noisy apartments, busy driveways choking gridlocked intersections, loss of solar access all winter, children with nowhere to play, moving trucks and garbage trucks blocking roads, and so many people crammed into a once-quiet neighborhood. All of this on streets lined with modest houses and homeowners who were not given the chance to prevent it.

I am seeking the following solutions and intervention on the City Council’s part:

- This development should not be granted a permit. The development needs to decrease the size to three stories and replace residential units with retail on the ground floor, per the zoning code and Comprehensive Plan.
- The upcoming Design Review Board meeting on September 17th should be cancelled, because the developer has not complied with zoning code and the Design Review Board should not approve a design that violates zoning code.
- Please re-examine the unlimited density in the RH-8 zone abutting residential. Adjust it to reflect the neighborhood plan and land use goals that are part of the comprehensive plan.
- In December 2015, the developer used a Citizen Amendment Request to change 6 parcels that were zoned residential to "Office." This is a misleading term because it did not communicate the possibility of high-density residential units next to single family homes. The zoning code description should reflect the term “office” or terms like “High-density Residential” and “Mixed Use” should be used so the community is not misled again.
- Please completely overhaul and modernize the notification process. The current process relies on community members being highly involved in local government through reading newspapers, reading city newsletters, visiting city websites, subscribing to city update email lists, and even physically visiting city hall to read notice boards.

Please do not set a precedent by allowing this huge, out-of-place development in our neighborhood that clearly conflicts with Kirkland’s zoning codes and Comprehensive Plan. Please do what is in the power of the Kirkland City Council to help our neighborhood keep its current family atmosphere, the traffic flow of those passing through, the safety of our children, and our quality of life. We are counting on you to hear us and make the vital changes necessary before the Continental Divide project is built.

Sincerely,

Michael Sandberg
Good Evening,

I am writing to give you some personal feedback on the Bridle Trails Shopping Center. It has come to my attention that a multiple story building with apartments and shopping is planned for that space. As a resident of Bridle Trails, I am opposed to higher density living in our VERY residential area. Many of us chose our homes because it was void of dense high rises and we enjoy the rural feel of our neighborhood.

I was unable to attend the meeting this evening as I’m attending my son’s curriculum night, but I will continue to place attention and energy to fighting this proposal now and in the future.

Thank you,

Mimi Stricker
Bridle Trails Resident
Dear Planning Commissioners,

I am a new owner at Rose Hill neighborhood, Overlook Village. We bought the property since it is in a quiet community of 11 freestanding homes which offer affordable housing in a very expensive Eastside market. Since our property is right next to Lee Johnson's lot separated by a fence, I am writing to express concerns about Lee Johnson's proposal to increase the height and density limits on their property. Concerns include increased noise and traffic as well as other possible issues depending on Lee Johnson's plans. We will already be feeling the effects of the New Bethlehem Project's permanent shelter when it opens as our property shares a fence with that location, too. Since I am unable to attend tonight's meeting, I felt I should make my concerns known before I can attend the meeting in October.

Sincerely,
Ming-Ting Sun
8038 118th CT NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Greetings:

I am a South Rose Hill Resident and neighbor of Martin and Sharon Morgan. I understand that my residents at 8230 122nd Ave is included in the expanded study area with the Morgan’s request to rezone parcels from RS 7.2 to RM or commercial zoning. I am not in favor of a rezoning to Office RH 8, Mixed Use Commercial PR 3.6 nor High density RM 1.8. I believe that any of these rezone options will not enhance the character of the South Rose Neighborhood and are already addressed in other areas of the neighborhood plan.

I do appreciate the complexity of planning for the future of South Rose Hill and addressing the needs of current and future residents. I understand that there is a vision to improve the diversity of housing types near an around the retail core. As I look at our neighborhood we already have some higher density housing and using this as a model I am not apposed to rezoning to allow developments like the properties at NE 84th Lane and 124th Ave NE. Thank you for you time and consideration.

Regards:

Nathan Iwamoto
8230 122nd Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Janice,

The maximum height of the rezone being considered in Kirkland Bridle Trails Shopping Center needs to be no higher than three stories total. If parking is a concern it needs to be underground.

5 stories above ground is atrocious in this small community neighborhood where nothing even close to that exists. Nothing in any of those sections including the nearby portions of Bellevue and Redmond are anything over two stories.

Restrict the rezone of anything in the Bridle Trails neighborhoods to a growth of height allowed to three stories only.

Thank you,

Patrick Leewens

LEEWENS CORPORATION  (425) 827-7667 ext 105  P.O. Box 2549  630 Seventh Ave  Kirkland, WA 98083  pat@leewens.com
Dear Planning Commissioners:

We are writing to formally state that we are strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density for the following reasons:

1. This would significantly change the character of the equestrian neighborhood. There is an entire culture and businesses that are based on this character. Placing this type of density in Bridle Trails would harm the character, and small economy of this area.

2. Lack of infrastructure. The Existing Roads cannot support this density and traffic increase along with all of the other background traffic growth. Since, the implementation of the toll lanes on 405, NE 70th Street has become increasingly busy, noisy, and dangerous. The quality of life of the local residents has deteriorated because of this. Also, 132nd has increased in rush hour traffic, to the point where residents can no longer turn into our neighborhood.
   a. Certainly a Traffic Engineer can make the argument that LOS for these roads can be met with some mitigation, but from a practical point of view it is a serious degradation that will not only impact residents, but also those who use this area as part of their daily life.
   b. Look closely at the surrounding streets, and ask yourself what is the practical reality that road widening would occur without significant impact to existing homes. There is not enough right of way, and since the area is 100% developed there are no developers that will be available to make these improvements.

3. Vertical Scale. Midrise buildings in this area are significantly out of scale with the adjacent uses. All surrounding uses are single family, and no more than two stories.

4. Horizontal Scale: With the majority of adjacent uses on one acre lots, density of this scale provides no layering of density, or buffering, and intensity of living that is not compatible.

5. This location for this type of use is “out of place”. Downtown the density makes sense, perhaps on 85th where there is commercial space and better infrastructure it makes sense. This location is simply not a good fit.

The future residents will also find themselves at odds with the access in and out. Upzoning the Shopping Center will cause negative public outcomes for both existing and future residents.

Certainly there is a better location for this increase in density. VOTE NO to increase heights.

Thank you,

Pete and Olga Lymberis
13220 NE 66th Street
My family has been involved in the Bridle Trails neighborhood for many years, as part of the equestrian community. We lived in Seattle because my husband’s medical practice was there, but we kept a horse at Central Pk. Stable and then rented a horse property. We moved here seven years ago when he retired. The horses have been, and continue to be a most important and unique activity here in Bridle Trails. The large lots are available for horse keeping, and the Park attracts many visitors for trail riding, horse shows, and nature walks. There is considerable traffic on both 116th and 132nd as drivers move to 405. We, along with many neighbors, are very opposed to any rezoning which includes a 6 story building, or smaller lots, both of which are incompatible with the nature of the Bridle Trails neighborhood.

Thank you for your consideration, Jane Plut

Dr. and Mrs. H.G. Plut
17 Bridlewood Circle
Kirkland, WA   98033
To: City of Kirkland Planning & Building Department

Regarding:
6425 128th Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
Tax ID 124150-0345-00

I am writing to confirm my support for changing the zoning on my property from RSX 35 to RSX 7.2 for the following reasons.

1. This property is NOT legally part of Silver Spurs Ranch Development. It belongs to Burke and Farrar’s Kirkland Addition. And, I only have access from NE 70th street.
2. The building of the mega home, south of this property, has cut off access to the bridle horse trail that goes up to Bridle Trails Park.
3. The mega homes South and West of my property are at least twice the size of most homes and both have outbuildings with larger footprints than my home. One has a very large garage with a mother-in-law apartment above. There are no barns for Horses, but instead sports courts.
4. Having three homes put on this property would hardly look any different than what’s been built on the adjacent properties.
5. Arguing that this is supposed to be an equestrian type property has become a dead issue for all practical purposes. I am sure if horses were boarded on my property that the neighbors would start to complain about the dust and flies and all the other things that come along with having horses.
6. From a personal perspective we would like to stay in our home here in Kirkland, but property taxes have severely cut into our fixed incomes. Selling off parts of this property would help pay those bills.

Thank you,

Robert W. Mix
To the members of the Planning Commission,

Based on my experience with my neighbors in the NE 85th Street Subarea, as a leader in the South Rose Hill/Bridle Trails Neighborhood Association, as a member of the city’s recent Housing Strategy Plan Advisory Group, and as a co-founder of Liveable Kirkland (but not representing any of these organizations in an official capacity for the purposes of this feedback), I offer the following suggestions to the recently proposed Land Use Zoning changes for the Rose Hill and Bridle Trails neighborhoods. (You may also find the latest revision of my comments online, including some meta-comments from my neighbors.) I will start by summarizing my recommendations. Below that, I have detailed the specific comments for each proposal. Beyond the proposals, I offer a few additional suggestions to help our neighbors and the city achieve their stated objectives.

Summary of most significant recommendations

1. To increase the availability of reasonably-sized homes within walking distance of amenities that meet people’s routine needs (to minimize the need for additional vehicular infrastructure), I urge the adoption of the Housing Strategy Advisory Group’s recommendation for more housing within a 5-10 minute area of commercial zones:

   a. In these areas, we should specifically enable small multiplex developments to be either (a) built within the common exterior form of a single family house or (b) a cluster of smaller homes. In addition to townhomes, these duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and bungalow courts are an alternative to the traditional methods for increasing density of residential zones with abrupt edges between traditional single-family homes and larger multiplexes.

   b. While existing rules do allow some duplexes, triplexes, and cottage villages, these rules are too restrictive and need to be relaxed so that their construction is more economically viable. In particular, I am calling for the elimination of restrictions beyond those which are applied to single family
homes in these areas, including:

i. Location restrictions, specifically the prohibition of additional developments within a given radius, as this precludes the intention of the 10-minute neighborhood concept.

ii. The unit size limits.

iii. FAR limits.

2. To enable the construction of more affordable market-rate homes, reduce parking requirements in areas within a 5-minute walk of commercial zones. Furthermore:

a. To minimize contention of on-street parking in these areas (and especially near major public transit facilities), establish a street parking utilization target, and regularly monitor utilization to ensure that it is not exceeded. Adjust street parking regulations and aggressively enforce them to ensure adequate availability of street parking at all times.

b. To establish transit as an economically-viable choice for in-city trips, developments which have benefited from reduced parking requirements shall provide free bus passes to their employees/residents, such as through King County Metro’s ORCA Passport programs (for multi-family and employers). We should work with King County Metro to expand this program so that it may be used for multi-family housing with less than 20 units.

Comments on specific proposals

1. Lake Washington Institute of Technology: I agree with the staff recommendation for options B and C, and especially option D (to first focus redevelopment in existing parking lot areas).

2. NE 85th Subarea/City

   a. 
To focus on transitioning 85th to a pedestrian-oriented commercial corridor, **focus new commercial development into the existing commercial-zoned area on 85th**, and not extending into the existing residential area.

b. To provide more residents within the walkshed of the commercial area, **broaden the residential rezone study area to include all areas within a 5 minute walk of the commercial areas**, specifically all properties between or adjoining NE 85th and 80th Streets (and possibly 90th Street).

c. To realize the goals of the Housing Strategy Plan in a way that more cleanly integrates with the existing residential neighborhood, **allow development of small multiplexes** which present the exterior form and scale of a single family house. This is a great opportunity for the city to make “missing middle housing” viable, including duplexes, triplexes, fourplexes, and bungalow courts.

d. To increase access to open space, **all residential developments should be encouraged (or required) to provide direct access to shared open space**, and include private gardens for some portion of these units. Requirements for shared open space could be relaxed for developments which are adjacent to public open space (i.e., parks or schools).

e. To enable the construction of more affordable market-rate homes, **reduce parking requirements** in this area (as described above).

f. To make streets safer for people of all ages in these areas, implement **traffic calming strategies on all residential streets where density is increased**. For example, replace parallel parking with angle-in parking on alternating sides of the street; see example [illustration](#).

3. **NE 85th Subarea/Jin**: See comments for #2/City, above, as this could maybe be adapted to some of the area between and adjacent to NE 85th and 90th Streets.

4. **NE 85th Subarea/Morgan**: See comments for #2/City, above. I agree with the planning department that commercial should be focused in existing areas, and
not extend into the residential area. Live/work lofts could be appropriate at 8249/8251, to transition between office and residential areas, across the street from existing office space.

5. NE 85th Subarea/City (BRT station area):

   a. To take advantage of the planned Bus Rapid Transit (BRT) infrastructure investment, **aggressively increase housing and commercial capacity** in this area, especially within a 5-minute walk of the planned BRT station.

   b. To enable the construction of more affordable market-rate homes, **reduce parking requirements in this area** as described above.

6. NE 85th Subarea/LMJ Enterprises: See comments for #5/City, above.

7. NE 85th Subarea/Madison Development: See comments for #5/City, above. Also, the adjustments requested by the developer are reasonable and appropriate to ensure that this critical site can be adequately developed.

8. Bridle Trails Neighborhood/Daniel Weise: The following adjustments to the proposal will effectively achieve more of the objectives listed in the decision matrix.

   a. To preserve equestrian land use while also creating more homes within the 5-minute walkshed of the Bridle Trails Shopping Center, I would recommend zoning this for multifamily equestrian. Crazy? Consider that not everyone who loves horses has a lot of money. To be honest, I expect that it’s quite possible for equestrians to be both “house poor” and “horse poor”! Furthermore, these are some of the few equestrian-sized lots that include sewer lines nearby which enable it to support small-scale multifamily development. Therefore, this would be a perfect place for this sort of development. Focus these small multiplexes in the corner or edge of each property, retaining the bulk of the land for equestrian use.

   b. 
To illustrate this concept, here is an example: instead of a 5000 square foot mansion, each site could have a 5000-square foot 4-plex containing (for example) a 2000 sqft unit and three 1000 sqft units. This would make the equestrian lifestyle a more affordable choice for middle-class families, empty-nesters, and singles.

c. Effect of these changes on the matrix: This adjustment would switch four of the ‘NO’ answers on the matrix to ‘YES’:

i. Consistent with vision statement: Yes, by retaining equestrian character.

ii. Compatible with adjacent uses: Yes, by retaining equestrian character and existing residential scale.

iii. Redevelopment potential in the area: Yes, as this model allows for retaining the required paddock area and minimum lot sizes.

iv. Meets goals of Housing Strategy Plan: Yes, by enabling the creation of ‘missing middle housing’ in this particularly unique area.

d. Further factual corrections to the matrix:

i. This site is within a 6-minute walk of KC Metro route 245, which features 15-minute frequency through most of the day.

ii. Lack of environmental constraints: Given the answer in the matrix (“No mapped streams or wetlands on parcels.”), it seems this should have been noted as ‘YES’.

9. Bridle Trails Shopping Center. I think this is the most controversial of all the proposals, and I'm least sure about my ideas around it...but I figured I'd throw this out here and see if we can further develop some ideas to address the
neighborhood’s concerns.

a. To better achieve the 10-minute neighborhood concept, more effectively achieve the goals of the Housing Strategy Plan, and improve the economic viability of local businesses while reducing the need to further increase the allowed height at neighborhood centers, **allow more missing middle housing types** within a 5-minute walk of the Bridle Trails commercial areas.

b. To provide a respectful transition between neighboring residences and this proposed development, the staff’s recommendation looks like a good option. Here’s another approach to consider: the development shall not exceed the height of existing adjacent residential building (including those across the street or alley) by more than 10 feet. The height of the development may increase by another 10 feet only where it is at least 100 feet from lower development, and only if shared open space is created on this site (according to some ratio to be determined by the planning department) . . . ideally featuring equestrian access and parking stalls. :)

c. To ensure that neighborhood concerns are met while also enabling the development of a project that supports the needs of the neighborhood, I would recommend that the neighbors organize and reach out to the developers to figure out what is necessary for the project to be economically viable, what concessions the developers and neighbors are willing to offer, potentially including adjustments beyond the immediate site.

**Additional suggestions**

1. To promote the 10-minute neighborhood concept and implement the Housing Strategy Plan, allow **missing middle style homes** *(small-scale multifamily)* **within a 5 minute walk of all commercial areas.**

2. To promote residential development in areas closest to existing commercial development while also protecting the most rural areas of our neighborhoods, allow **transfer of development rights (TDR),** enabling underdeveloped sites to
sell their existing development rights to other sites within a 5 minute walk of commercial areas, so long as the donating site meets all (or maybe just two) of the following qualifications:

a. Underdeveloped based on current land use and zoning.

b. More than ½ mile from any commercial zone.

c. Does not have adjacent sewer service.

3. Neighborhood commercial: To meet the routine needs of residents in existing neighborhoods, which lack walkable access to businesses, create a **pilot program permitting a limited number of residential neighborhood businesses**. This would only be allowed where:

a. The business is one of the following neighborhood-oriented types:

   i. food: groceries, cafes, meal co-ops, food trucks
   
   ii. recreation: gyms, pools, sport courts
   
   iii. socialization: pubs, cafes, guest houses
   
   iv. creation: maker spaces, rehearsal spaces, tool sheds/garages
   
   v. care: child care, health care, senior care, pet care, salons

b. The building maintains a primarily residential character.

c. The site is at least a 15 minute walk from any existing commercial zoned
area.

d. The site is on a thru street, with vehicular access on both ends.

e. The business does not advertise this location outside a 15-minute walking radius.

f. The business does not produce more exterior noise than would be normal for a residence.

g. Some amount of street parking is readily available within a 1 minute walk.

h. The business receives a limited-time license to operate (2 years, or maybe up to 4 years for certain low-risk/high-benefit types); further license renewal would be subject to feedback from neighbors.

Thank you for considering this feedback.

Rodney Rutherford
8222 122nd Ave NE
Kirkland, WA 98033
+1-206-973-7579
September 11, 2018

Planning Commission and Senior Planner Joan Lieberman-Brill
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, WA 98033

Dear Planning Commission and Senior Planner Joan Lieberman-Brill,

Re: South Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update
   and
   Land Use or Zoning Change File CAM18-00082 #2

We are residents of the South Rose Hill Neighborhood since 1997. We reside in the 85th Street Subarea Plan, and are in the expanded study area (for the Martin and Sharon Morgan request to rezone four properties they own: from single family residential and medium density to commercial or higher residential density).

Our concerns include:

1. **Traffic and Parking issues along 122nd Ave NE between NE 85th and NE 80th Streets**
   It is apparent that onsite parking is currently inadequate for businesses situated along NE 85th Street in the vicinity of 122nd Ave NE. This is shown by employees parking their vehicles offsite; they park on both sides of 122nd Ave NE, mostly towards NE 85th Street. With cars parked on both sides of the road, much of 122nd Ave NE, which is designated as a two-lane street, is restricted to one-lane traffic flow. 122nd Ave NE is not wide enough to accommodate two-lane traffic and cars parked on both shoulders. Compounding this problem is the backed-up Starbucks corner traffic that sometimes completely blocks 122nd Ave NE.

   Problems associated with the forced, one-lane traffic flow on 122nd Ave NE include that it is often difficult and unsafe to turn into NE 82nd Lane from 122nd Ave NE to access our home; and likewise difficult and unsafe to turn from NE 82nd Lane into 122nd Ave NE. We and our neighbors can describe dangerous situations caused by these traffic problems. We are concerned about potential accidents and injury.

   Rezoning to higher density would exacerbate the traffic and parking problems along 122nd Ave NE, and thus increase safety concerns.

**We recommend:**

a. Parking along 122nd Ave NE between NE 85th Street and NE 80th Street be restricted to *one side of the road* to keep traffic flow in two lanes.

b. Maintaining low-density residential zoning south of the current commercial zoning along NE 85th Street. Rezoning to higher commercial or residential density (as in the Morgan request) *should not be approved*.

c. Traffic calming along 122nd Ave NE would help to *reduce speeding vehicles* and thus increase safety.

d. Sidewalks *continued along both sides* of 122nd Ave NE for pedestrian safety.
2. Planning for Growth
Another exacerbating factor for traffic problems is the development planned along and north of NE 85th Street at the current commercial zoned site of Petco and surrounding businesses, between 120th Ave NE and 122nd Ave NE. This proposed development will likely generate significantly more traffic that will further impact traffic and parking issues along 122nd Ave NE between NE 85th Street and NE 80th Street.

We commend the City for planning ahead to accommodate the projected increase in population growth and the resulting need for increased residential and commercial density. However, increased density requires suitable infrastructure resources. 122nd Ave NE has limited capacity to handle traffic and parking for current use, and thus does not have the capacity for increased commercial and/or increased residential density access along its length.

We recommend:
The City maintains low-density residential housing as the primary land use in the areas south of the current commercial zoning along NE 85th Street, east of 120th Avenue NE.

3. Public Walkway along NE 82nd Lane
We and our adjacent neighbors are concerned about pedestrians using our private lane, NE 82nd Lane, which functions as a shared driveway. When backing our cars out of our garages, it is difficult to see pedestrians who walk across easements and in NE 82nd Lane. Sometimes joggers, children, and/or dogs run outside our line of vision and sometimes distracted mothers are inadvertently pushing strollers into our car paths. We are concerned about safety, for ourselves and for pedestrians who are walking/jogging in NE 82nd Lane.

We recommend:
If the City is determined to keep the pedestrian walkway by using easements on private land, the City needs to address safely concerns by constructing a walkway for pedestrians in a manner that keeps pedestrians from walking/running in NE 82nd Lane, which is a shared driveway. At a minimum, signage should be added at both ends of NE 82nd Lane encouraging pedestrians to stay on the pavement and to be aware of reversing vehicles.

We trust that you will seriously consider our concerns for the safety of residents and people using our neighborhood.

Sincerely,

Paul and Sharon Rodman
12221 NE 82nd Lane
Kirkland WA 98033
To whom it may concern,

I, as the property owner of 8245 122nd ave NE, am opposed to the rezoning proposal requested by Martin and Sharon Morgan. The proposal lists four properties, mine being one of them.

The area south of 85th st. on 122nd ave NE needs to maintain a low density for a litany of reasons. The current infrastructure combined with stacked commercial zoning down 85th already leads to amounts of congestion that are not in line with that of a residential neighborhood.

The close proximity to multiple schools does not need heavier or higher speed traffic. Speeding is already a dangerous problem that has not been addressed on this street. It’s seen by many commuters as a shortcut between many arterial streets of 85th and 405.

The current layout of businesses already cause parking problems, in addition to service disruption for things like mail delivery and waste management services.

Residents are attracted to the Rose Hill neighborhood for its appeal as a quieter, more aesthetically pleasing alternative to dense metropolitan neighborhoods. Proposals like the one made are not made by people who wish to live in the area, and they only benefit those looking to develop and move on.

I therefore request that the current zoning be kept in place, and that the area south of 85th street be added to regulations protecting this density.

Sincerely,
Sharon Velozo
Hi
I am a resident of Bridle Trails Bellevue and I oppose the rezoning of the bridle trails shopping center.

Sheli Hadari
From: Shelly Bowman [mailto:shellybowman@hotmail.com]
Sent: Friday, September 14, 2018 10:41 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Cc: Shelly Bowman <shellybowman@hotmail.com>
Subject: Development

Hello,
I expect any new development in an Eastside City to have safe connected routes for people that bike and people that walk. Trees and park.space are mandatory-it's why we live here.

To develop for sheer profits vs creating a healthy vibrant place to live play and work for people, and a thriving sustainable environment is wrong, short-sited selfish behavior. If you love Detroit, it is there for all, but we want a better place.

We want PNW beautiful sustainable development with multi-mode commuting options. I sure hope you are capable of visionary work. A new tall box and car parking is not welcomed here.

Build condos, stop with all.the cheaply made apts.

Thank you,
Shelly Bowman and Lizette Hedberg

Sent from my Verizon 4G LTE smartphone

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello!

I am writing because I wanted to let you know that I am opposed to the Bridle Trails Center rezone allowing the shopping center to have a new height limit. A six story building would be so damaging to our area. NE70th would be so overcrowded with traffic and the local elementary school is already full! We do not want an additional 2000 residents living in that small shopping center space! The beauty of the bridle trails area is in the fact that the properties are spaced out nicely allowing for equestrian activity and a balanced population. We do not want everyone crammed in there! It will totally change the character of our neighborhood! Please do not allow this change to be made or for this height modification to be approved!

Thank you for your help,

Stephanie DiJulio
From: Steve Allison
To: Planning Commissioners; Eric Shields; Janice Coogan; Adam Weinstein
Date: Sunday, August 12, 2018 9:45:26 PM

I am strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 - changing the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.
I’m writing to express my strong opposition to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7.

This plan changes the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet and includes mixed use and higher density development. I feel this would significantly change the character of our quiet equestrian neighborhood.

I strongly oppose the change for the following reasons:

1) Consistency with the vision statement. There is absolutely no guarantee that increasing the density and adding 1197 residential units would attract “local quality shops and services”. In fact, as we experienced when Red Apple Market left the shopping center, neither the community nor the local government has any say over what retail outlets property owners seek. There is nothing about the current shopping center (nor the currently allowed 30’ elevation development and 598 residential units) which is incompatible with the draft vision statement.

2) Compatibility with adjacent uses. The proposed increased density development is absolutely not compatible with adjacent uses. We live in a low-density equestrian community. People keep and ride horses. There is no way in which the additional density and the resulting traffic and noise is in any way compatible with this residential neighborhood. This is not downtown Redmond or downtown Kirkland. It is a neighborhood.

3) Increase in “affordable” housing (per housing strategy plan). The current zoning allows for 598 residential units with 59 marked as affordable housing. Doubling the total allowable residential units only adds 40 additional affordable housing units. Doubling the allowable residential density to add only forty additional affordable units isn’t in any way worth the disruption and cost to the neighborhood.

4) Unanimous property owner support - absolutely not. Nobody I have talked to in my neighborhood thinks this is a good idea. Unanimous, in that sample size, is a disheartening claim.

5) The support for this proposal focuses on the “economic” benefits of the plan. However, it is ignoring the detriments that accompany this population density.

- Traffic on NE 70th and even 132nd is already horrendous. It shouldn’t take me 20-30 minutes to drive from downtown Redmond to my home in Bridle Trails, yet it regularly does. And this is not downtown Seattle, Kirkland, Bellevue or Redmond. People drive cars. They drive cars to and from work. They drive cars to take children to sports practices, to go to the doctor, to get to mass
transit centers. You will be adding thousands of cars to an already congested area. I have seen no evidence or report by the city on how they will address this issue. Choosing to “believe” that people will magically begin using mass transit is naive at best, and in reality, simply irresponsible.

- A development of this density will also be adding hundreds of children to the local schools, which are already using portable classrooms because they have exceeded capacity. I understand that developers are required to pay the education impact fees. However, those fees are not enough. And there is a significant lag time between when developers pay those fees and schools can receive and use those fees to actually address overcrowding that development of this scale causes.

As representatives of the the Bridle Trails community you serve, I can not urge you strongly enough to reject Neighborhood Plan Policy change PT 7.

Thank you,
Steven Donahue
6329 133RD AVE NE
From: S. Davis [mailto:spicker76@yahoo.com]

Sent: Sunday, September 2, 2018 10:13 AM
To: Adam Weinstein <AWeinstein@kirklandwa.gov>; Stephanie Croll <SCroll@kirklandwa.gov>; City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>; Kurt Triplett <KTriplett@kirklandwa.gov>; Kevin Raymond <KRaymond@kirklandwa.gov>; Eric Shields <EShields@kirklandwa.gov>; Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>

Subject: Neighborhood plan updates - adds/deletes are not being tracked by the city

Hello City officials,

I would like to point out that we need the planning department to step up and fully disclose all of the changes they are making to the North Rose Hill, South Rosehill, 85th Sub Area and Bridle trails.

I think the city should be required to show in this 1st draft ALL OF THE CHANGES from the current plan. Kind of like when an agreed upon law is changed the people should see the changes, adds and deletes to the current law. These neighborhood plans which become part of laws for our GMA plan needs to have underlines to show what would be added to the law, or "strike-through" lines to show the parts of the law that would be removed.

The city has decided to combine these 4 unique neighborhoods into one plan which many think is a bad idea. Especially since only a few neighborhood association people (heavy on south rose hill residents, Rodney Rutherford and Martin Morgan both out spoken and Martin has a rezone request in with the city) and the city planning department has taken to dramatically revising these neighborhood plans. [http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=36.70A.035](http://apps.leg.wa.gov/rcw/default.aspx?cite=36.70A.035)

I have reviewed to the best I cold my neighborhood (North Rose Hill) and the 85th sub area) vs original plan. However it has taken me hours and I truly believe the city per the law needs to produce a document that states all of the changes from the current plan.

I asked Adam over a month ago about getting a copy of the draft plan submitted at the June 26 planning commission mtg and all of the tracked changes (edits, adds, deletes) as this can be done especially in MS WORD. I was told that since all of these plans were combined they did not track changes but will start tracking changes going forward of this new 1st draft plan.

They can copy in all of the existing plans into one MSWORD file and then make their...
edits.

A second point regarding the Comprehensive Plan is the dozens of inconsistencies that will be created with the draft plan and the current agreed upon plan for over the past 20 yrs (esp Bridle Trails). There are major conflicts in the draft Neighborhood Plan for land use and I believe this needs to be documented. These plans are much more vague and I believe that this will then create even more areas of "interpretation" for the city planners when a developer wants to make a major change. In the long run this is a lose-lose situation for everybody especially current residents.

Comprehensive Planning is dictated by GMA. It necessarily requires broad public outreach and input. These current plans have been in place for years and dramatically changing them in one year does not seem right.


Thank you for your time on this matter.

Susan Davis spicker76@yahoo.com Have a GREAT day! : )

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
Hello Commissioners,

This is Tod Johnson from Lee Johnson Auto Family and LMJ Enterprises, LP owner of the Lee Johnson property. I know that you will be reviewing our site as a part of your overall recommendations to the City Council for the 20 year comprehensive plan review. You will be receiving a letter from Jack McCullough in reference to our site this evening. This letter outlines the desired outcome for our site. As a follow up to this letter, I’d like to schedule an individual meeting with each of you over the course of the next couple of weeks so that we can discuss this in greater detail. I appreciate everything you do in serving on this committee and I am sure that you all have busy lives outside of your service to the community so I will make my schedule as flexible as possible. You can reach me via e-mail at tjohnson@leejohnson.com.

Thank you again and I look forward to meeting with each of you in the coming weeks.

Tod Johnson

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
To:  
Janice Coogan  
Senior Planner  
425-587-3257  
jcoogan@kirklandwa.gov

Terry Trimingham  
Kirkland, WA  
425-240-4500  
ttrim02@yahoo.com

29 August 2018

Dear Ms. Coogan,

As a longtime resident in this area, I am very strongly opposed to Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - Policy BT 7 – to change the current building height at the Bridle Trails Shopping Center from 30 feet to 60+ feet including mixed use and higher density. This change would significantly change the character of our equestrian neighborhood.

I urge the commission to consider how exactly will taller buildings preserve the equestrian character of this area? Taller buildings block the sun and dwarf the trees. Also, taller buildings can easily spur changes to the boundaries of the commercial area, which will encroach on our neighborhood. WE LIKE THE NEIGHBORHOOD AS IT IS.

Allowing the taller buildings and the proposed re-development with housing will bring in a LOT MORE TRAFFIC into an area that already suffers from Google and Microsoft commuters.

What exactly is a “rooftop amenity”, and how would one make this area better for ALL neighbors? No one that I know enjoys living in a fishbowl. As it is, our current neighborhood is changing from one-story ramblers to gigantic two-story monsters. Do you live next to something like that? I do. It is not pleasant. I would HATE to see the Bridle Trails Shopping Center turn into something like Juanita Village. That type of change does NOT support “maintaining the equestrian character” of the current neighborhood as stated in the new draft vision statement.
No one that I have spoken with wants a zoning change to the Bridle Trails shopping center.

There have already been zoning changes along the 85th street corridor in the Rose Hill/Bridle Trails area to accommodate high density, please, focus on that and do not ruin the Bridle Trails Shopping Center with more of the same.

Thanks to our current zoning, and along with the hard work of the equestrian community to protect and preserve what we have, our neighborhood is a jewel of a “rural” getaway.

Those of us that have lived in this neighborhood have been key in retaining and saving Bridle Trails State Park. The City of Kirkland directly benefits from our past efforts.

I would appreciate it if the City of Kirkland would support our current efforts by not allowing Policy BT 7 to move forward.

I am not alone. If you would like, I’m happy to provide a list of names and signatures that support my point of view.

Most Sincerely,

Terry Trimingham
Adam,

If a response is warranted, please respond within five business days.

Thanks.

Jeannie McGivern  
City Manager’s Office  
City of Kirkland  
123 5th Avenue  
Kirkland, WA 98033  
jmcgivern@kirklandwa.gov  
(425) 587-3016

-----Original Message-----
From: William Gurrad [mailto:wggurraddds@comcast.net]
Sent: Saturday, September 15, 2018 7:09 PM
To: City Council <citycouncil@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: Bridle Trails shopping center

It has been alarming to watch the planning committee ignore the neighborhood's voice on the subject of increasing height limits for the center. When the representative for tech city company stated that it was the city of Kirkland initiating an inquiry into them having any desire to redevelop their parcel in which they stated they had no plans but could look into that matter. Does the city council realize they are the people and need to listen to their voices as the council would not be in existence if it were not for the citizens. With all topography taken into concern and adjacent structures 3 stories is the maximum with topography taken into concern. Any structures above that height limit would not be conducive to neighborhood character and certainly require building a multi story parking garage to accommodate increased cars in the property. I believe in Kirkland and hope Kirkland is more important to you than simply increased housing which burdens the schools, city services, and transportation. The federal government does not know what is best for us, We Do. Thanks for your attention, Bill Gurrad Sent from my iPhone

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
-----Original Message-----
From: Wray Featherstone [mailto:wfxidaho@gmail.com]
Sent: Wednesday, September 12, 2018 2:06 PM
To: Planning Commissioners <PlanningCommissioners@kirklandwa.gov>
Subject: proposed upzone of Bridle trails shopping center

Dear Commission members,

My family moved to Bridle View in August 1985. We loved the feeling of likeminded neighbors who had pride in and took care of their property.

We also loved the convenience of the Bridle View Shopping Center. It had a quality grocery store, postal substation, bank, and several small businesses and restaurants. economics and the need for higher profit margins have continued to change the character of this neighborhood treasure.

Many residents of the adjoining neighborhoods were also able to walk to the center and shop and take care of other errands. Sadly, 132nd Ave and NE 70th have now become arterials for the tremendously overloaded 405.

School children trying to reach the Ben Franklin school two blocks away are at risk every day. Stand at the corner of 132nd Ave and NE 61st ST and watch how many drivers don’t even stop at the marked crosswalks. Parents have been forced to form carpools to drive the four or five blocks to school.

If the Houghton Neighborhood, which is closer to 405 and the South Kirkland Park and Ride, strongly opposed a similar up zone imagine our feeling. Adding six story buildings containing hundreds of apartments will further congest and destroy the neighborhood we now call home.

We all understand the goal of a project like this is purely profit despite unsupported statements to the contrary. It will further put pressure on already inadequate streets and sidewalks. This six story proposal WILL ADD NOTHING to the wellbeing of nearby residents. Let’s call it what it is - A PROFIT DRIVEN PROPOSAL. I doubt that you will find any of the Principals living in these “affordable” units.

I don’t know how long any of you have lived in Kirkland, but I know you are working against tremendous odds to build a great city. That being said, it is not your responsibility to clean up the mess huge corporations create as a byproduct of jobs. Please help us maintain a sense of community that allows us to feel that those of us who protected parks (insert Bridle Trails Park Foundation here) with our own hard earned money have some say in the survival of our own neighborhoods.

Sincerely,

Wray Featherstone
13330NE 61st ST
Kirkland, Wa. 98033
425-883-4821

NOTICE: This e-mail account is part of the public domain. Any correspondence and attachments, including
personal information, sent to and from the City of Kirkland are subject to the Washington State Public Records Act, Chapter 42.56 RCW, and may be subject to disclosure to a third party requestor, regardless of any claim of confidentiality or privilege asserted by an external party.
September 13, 2018

VIA ELECTRONIC MAIL

Planning Commission
City of Kirkland
123 5th Avenue
Kirkland, Washington 98033-6189

Re: Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan Update

Dear Planning Commission Members:

We are writing on behalf of LMJ Enterprises, LP, owner of the property located at the southeast quadrant of the I-405 interchange at NE 85th Street (the “Property”). The Property comprises zones 2A, 2B and 2C in the Rose Hill Business District in the Kirkland Zoning Code (the “Code”).

In July, we presented suggestions to the Planning Commission regarding further refinements to the zoning proposal for the Property. This has been carried forward as #6 in your staff report to the Planning Commission dated August 4, 2018 (the “Staff Report”). We have had an opportunity to review the Staff Report and wanted to offer the following comments:

• We strongly endorse the recommendation to allow this proposal to proceed to public hearing.
  o It is important that the additional height apply to a large enough portion of the site to make a real density difference.
  o We also believe that the lot coverage and parking requirements for the site need to be addressed.

• For the longer-term proposal (160’ heights), we suggest that waiting until the transit station is complete to consider this proposal may be too late. Planning, permitting and construction of a major project takes 5 years at least. That is close to the time window within which the transit station will be complete. Market interest in more substantial development of the site will begin before the transit center opens, not afterward. It is important to create the vision now, or else the site may just be developed as wood-frame 75’ product. At that point, the higher density alternative is lost.
September 13, 2018
Page 2 of 2

Our proposal would create a path to a higher density plan now, but the path would not be certain. It would be enough to attract interest—serious interest—in the plan now, before lower-density options take over. But by involving the City Council in final decision-making, continuing high levels of City scrutiny would be assured.

We appreciate the opportunity to provide these comments and we look forward to the public hearing.

Sincerely,

[Signature]

John C. McCullough

cc: Tod Johnson
    Joan Lieberman-Brill, AICP
    Janice Coogan