Chapter 2

Description of the Alternatives

2.1 Introduction

This chapter describes the Proposal studied in this Draft Supplemental Environmental Impact Statement (DSEIS) and compares the DSEIS alternatives to alternatives previously studied in 2008.

2.1.1 Proposal

The City of Kirkland (City) is considering alternative locations for accommodating additional commercial growth in or near Downtown Kirkland (Downtown) (Figure 2-1). The City previously studied additional employment growth and adopted ordinances approving the Touchstone (Parkplace) Private Amendment Request in 2008. The City has prepared this DSEIS to review alternatives to growth on the Parkplace site to comply with a Central Puget Sound Growth Management Hearings Board order and its interpretation of the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA) Rules, which requires consideration of off-site alternatives for legislative actions and private rezones in some situations.1

The City is reevaluating its previous approval of the Touchstone (Parkplace) Comprehensive Plan and Zoning and Municipal Code amendments using the additional information provided in this DSEIS. The City is also considering additional amendments to the Transportation and Capital elements of the Comprehensive Plan, and techniques that can be used to impose mitigation requirements on project applicants. Following consideration of this new information, the City may decide to reaffirm or modify its prior decision. Specifically, the Proposal studied in this DSEIS includes the following actions:

- Amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Kirkland Zoning and Municipal Codes to allow for 954,000 additional square feet of retail and office uses in or near Downtown.
- Amend the City of Kirkland Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements of the Comprehensive Plan to include all necessary capital improvements and a multi-year financing plan based on the 10-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan, including those supporting Downtown growth.
- Approve a Planned Action Ordinance to facilitate future environmental review of selected properties in Downtown.

The City will also consider other implementing tools to ensure financing of transportation improvements. Such tools may take the form of a development agreement with one or more property owners consistent with RCW 36.70B.170, or a similar technique.

Alternative locations to achieve the Proposal were evaluated and are documented in the Commercial Growth Alternatives Site Selection Study (2010), which is discussed further below and included with this DSEIS as Appendix A. Once the City has considered the additional alternatives, it may choose to re-adopt the 2008 ordinances, amend the 2008 ordinances, or approve a different alternative.

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

The DSEIS alternatives would vary the location of additional growth in or near Downtown. The location of the alternative would, in turn, determine the type of Comprehensive Plan Land Use, Zoning, and other plan and regulatory amendments that may be required. The DSEIS Alternatives are additional options to those considered in the 2008 Final Environmental Impact Statement (FEIS) Alternatives.

Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS Alternatives – 2008

In 2008, the City studied placing new growth in Downtown on one particular property, Parkplace, an 11.5-acre site located at 457 Central Way. The site is currently developed with a mix of retail and office uses. The City completed the Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS for the Parkplace site in October 2008. The 2008 FEIS Alternatives included the following:

- **Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone Private Amendment Request [PAR]).** Approve a PAR by Touchstone to amend the City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan policies, Zoning Code, and Zoning Map, allowing redevelopment of the Parkplace retail and office complex with approximately 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use. To achieve the redevelopment, increased building heights, reduced setbacks, parking requirement reductions, and other related code amendments were under consideration for this alternative. The approximate net increase in growth between the No Action (below) and Proposed Action for the Parkplace site was 954,000 square feet.

- **FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved).** Develop the same 954,000 square feet of employment uses on the Parkplace retail and office complex as the Proposed Action but design future development with different height and setbacks in relation to Peter Kirk Park and Central Way, and apply new design guidelines. This alternative was approved by the City in 2008 through Comprehensive Plan, Zoning, and planned action ordinances.

- **No Action (2008 Parkplace Site).** Continue growth under the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code on the Parkplace site and elsewhere in the City considering a horizon year of 2022. This alternative would permit a total of 838,700 square feet of retail and office uses on the Parkplace site and results in a net increase in growth over the current site conditions of 600,250 square feet of office and retail space.

DSEIS Alternatives - 2010

Although no other specific proposals are before the City apart from the Touchstone (Parkplace) proposal described above, the City is considering alternative sites in Downtown where an additional 954,000 square feet of retail and office could be located. This DSEIS analyzes additional alternatives to the Touchstone proposal not previously studied in the 2008 FEIS.

The DSEIS on-site and off-site alternatives were identified with the aid of the Commercial Growth Alternatives Site Selection Study (Appendix A) conducted in May 2010. The study identifies the policy and land use concepts guiding commercial growth in the City, location of large properties, environmental constraints, location of transit and other infrastructure, development capacity, and the ability to meet planning objectives for a range of properties citywide and in the Downtown vicinity. As a result of the study, three alternatives were selected for detailed review in the DSEIS including the Superblock Alternative, Unified Ownership Alternative, and the Off-Site Alternative.
made up of three blocks in or near the Downtown. These alternatives can be compared to the DSEIS No Action Alternative as well as the prior 2008 FEIS Alternatives.

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

The DSEIS alternatives are described as follows. The alternatives are further described in Section 2.4 of this chapter.

- **Superblock Alternative.** This reduced intensity alternative spreads development throughout the “Superblock” located between Central Way, 6th Street, Kirkland Way, and Peter Kirk Park. This is considered an on-site alternative since development amount, intensity, height, and bulk would also be commensurately reduced on the Parkplace site compared to 2008 FEIS Alternatives. The growth on the Parkplace site alone would still increase above the No Action Alternative, but the increase would be approximately 482,000 square feet instead of 954,000. The remainder of the square footage increase, or 472,000 square feet, would be spread to the area on the Superblock south of Parkplace. This alternative would designate the block as a Planned Action.

- **Unified Ownership Alternative.** This alternative locates additional growth on Parkplace and the Post Office site. For purposes of the SEIS, the Unified Ownership Alternative is considered an on-site alternative, which also includes some off-site development. The level of growth on the Parkplace site is similar to the Superblock Alternative and less than the 2008 FEIS Alternatives at about 482,000 square feet of office and retail uses above the No Action Alternative. Development amount, intensity, height and bulk would also be reduced on the Parkplace site compared to 2008 FEIS Alternatives. The Post Office site would redevelop to contain 472,000 square feet of office and retail uses above the No Action Alternative. Each site is in single ownership which would make it easier to coordinate master planning and amenities on the two sites. This alternative would designate the Parkplace portion of the alternative as a Planned Action.

- **Off-Site Alternative.** This alternative would allow Parkplace to develop consistent with the No Action Alternative and spread the 954,000 square feet increase to other blocks in and near the Downtown including two blocks north of Parkplace across Central Way and one block west of Peter Kirk Park. This alternative would not designate the site(s) as a Planned Action.

- **No Action Alternative.** For purposes of comparison, the No Action Alternative assumes growth consistent with the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code for the blocks under study to the year 2022.

The Commercial Growth Alternatives Site Selection Study (Appendix A) concluded that none of the potential sites identified would by themselves meet the City’s objectives at lower environmental cost and were not, therefore, “reasonable alternatives” pursuant to SEPA (Washington Administrative Code [WAC] 197-11-440(5)(d)); however, collectively some sites together were recommended for study. This SEIS provides an evaluation of an off-site alternative for the purposes of comparison and provides environmental information to decision makers and the public. It also evaluates two on-site alternatives, the Superblock Alternative and Unified Ownership Alternative, which include some off-site development.
2.1.3 Proposal Objectives

SEPA rules encourage the description of a proposal’s objectives to allow measurement of the alternatives relative to the objectives. The City developed the following objectives for employment growth in Downtown when the Planning Commission considered the Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative in 2008. The objectives have been refined and applied to the DSEIS Alternatives according to the process described in Appendix A:

- **Capacity for Employment.** Develop a vital Downtown employment base and concentrate jobs in an appropriate urban environment. Significantly increase office square footage adjacent to the Downtown core as a way to enhance the core area for retail and service businesses. Encourage office as a part of mixed use development to promote a more compact and sustainable land use pattern.

- **Create Opportunities for Successful Retail Uses.** Create a vibrant destination retail development in Downtown. Encourage neighborhood convenience retail that will give residents the option of shopping within the City. Create enhanced retail activity and increased retail sales tax for the City.

- **Site Size and Configuration that Encourages Amenities.** Size and configuration of site allows the creation of high quality public open spaces. Create more “third places” where residents can go to gather, be entertained, and socialize in a variety of indoor and outdoor settings. Create safe and fun places for the City’s youth to go and meet with friends. Activate open space edges with ground-floor retail uses.

- **Pedestrian Orientation.** Strengthen existing and create new pedestrian connections. Create a new north–south street that breaks up the “Superblock” and provides additional pedestrian and vehicular connections.

- **Neighborhood Compatibility.** Ensure that intensive mixed use development is sited to reduce land use conflicts with existing residential neighborhoods.

- **Transit-Oriented Development.** Locate additional employment close to existing Downtown transit center, shops, and services to reduce the dependence on single occupant vehicle use. Support the existing Downtown transit center by locating new jobs in close proximity to increase transit ridership and foster improved transit service for the Downtown.

2.2 Planning Process

2.2.1 Growth Management Act Comprehensive Plan

The Growth Management Act (GMA) contains a comprehensive framework for managing growth and development in local jurisdictions. King County and all cities within it are subject to the requirements of GMA. Comprehensive plans for all cities planning under the GMA must include elements for land use, housing, transportation, capital facilities, and utilities as well as parks and recreation and economic development. Each city’s Comprehensive Plan must address capacity to accommodate projected regional growth; the plan must also ensure that infrastructure can support planned growth at a locally acceptable level of service.
The City adopted its Comprehensive Plan in conformance with the GMA in 1995 and completed a 10-year update in 2004. Consistent with GMA requirements, the City has made annual amendments to its Comprehensive Plan since its original adoption.

The Proposal would require amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan to allow for additional employment growth in Downtown, and address capital facilities and transportation facilities to support growth. The consistency of the alternatives with the City’s Comprehensive Plan is described in Section 3.1, Land Use Patterns and Plans and Policies.

### 2.2.2 Development Regulations

Development regulations are intended to implement a Comprehensive Plan’s goals and policies by providing specific standards and regulations for development. Zoning regulations guide land uses, building heights, building setbacks, parking, and other standards related to the development and use of land.

The Proposal would require amendments to the City’s Zoning Code to permit additional employment growth on the alternative sites. The consistency of the alternatives with the City’s Zoning Code is described in Section 3.1, Land Use Patterns and Plans and Policies.

### 2.2.3 Planned Action Ordinance

The Proposal includes the adoption of a planned action ordinance, which could be applied to any of the alternatives under review in either the 2008 FEIS or this DSEIS. As discussed below, however, the DSEIS assumes that the Off-Site Alternative would not be designated as a planned action. This variation would have no substantive consequences, but could modify the procedures used to review subsequent proposals.

The basic steps in designating a planned action are to prepare an Environmental Impact Statement (EIS), designate the planned action area and anticipated projects by ordinance, and review permit applications for consistency with the ordinance (see WAC 197-11-164 to 172). A planned action EIS streamlines environmental review for future development proposals and also eliminates future threshold determinations when a project is consistent with the planned action ordinance.

### 2.3 Environmental Review

#### 2.3.1 Prior Environmental Review

On October 16, 2008, the City completed the Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS addressing Parkplace and two additional properties. This DSEIS is a supplement to that 2008 FEIS.

On October 15, 2004, the City issued an FEIS for the proposed City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan. This document addresses future growth throughout the City and its planning area, including Downtown—which is the focus of this SEIS—as well as Totem Center, which is referenced in proposed amendments to the City’s capital facilities and transportation elements. Subsequent SEPA addenda and checklists relevant to redevelopment of the Totem Lake Mall in the Totem Center area include:
• Zoning Code, Zoning Map and Municipal Code Amendments, EIS Addendum, for TL 4-TL 11 Zones (not including TL 9), issued on October 24, 2004, File ZON04-00020,
• Hart Private Amendment Request issued on January 17, 2008, File ZON06-00019,
• TL 9 Zoning Implementation issued on January 17, 2008, File ZON07-00023,
• Zoning Code amendments to the TL 6A zone for affordable housing, issued on May 13, 2009, File ZON09-00006, and
• Amendments to the Zoning Code and Municipal Code for affordable housing incentives and requirements, issued on November 18, 2009, File ZON09-00005.

In addition, other SEPA environmental addenda and checklists for non-project actions since issuance of the 2008 FEIS include the following:
• Commute Trip Reduction Plan, issued on July 11, 2008,
• Active Transportation Plan, issued on February 4, 2009,
• LSM and Cottage Housing Zoning and Municipal Code Amendments, issued on July 14, 2008, File No. ZON08-00007,
• Costco Wholesale Private Amendment Request to RH 1B zone issued on September 29, 2008, File ZON07-00017,
• South Kirkland Park and Ride – City-Initiated Amendments to support Transit-Oriented-Development (TOD) issued on October 22, 2008, File ZON08-00002,
• CBD Amendments (upper story stepbacks, superior retail, building heights, etc.) – City Council initiated. Issued on January 14, 2009, File ZON08-00019,
• Fast Track Zoning Code Amendments, issued on March 9, 2009, File ZON09-00002,
• Stormwater code amendments to KMC Section 15.04 and new stormwater design manual proposed by Public Works. Implements Stormwater Master Plan adopted in 2005. Issued on May 12, 2009,
• Shoreline Master Program update (goals, policies and regulations) issued on July 15, 2009, File ZON06-00017, and
• Update to KZC Chapter 95 Tree Regulations issued on October 19, 2009, File ZON08-00016.

Where appropriate, prior environmental review was assessed in the course of preparing this DSEIS. Additionally, for purposes of the Comprehensive Plan amendments addressing the Totem Center vicinity, the City adopts the 2004 EIS and associated addenda and determinations of non-significance. Please also see the Fact Sheet.

2.3.2 Scope of SEIS Review

As described in the SEPA Rules (WAC 197-11-405(4)), the purpose of an SEIS is to add information and analysis to supplement the information in a previous EIS. An SEIS may address new alternatives. Scoping for an SEIS is optional.

The City has prepared this DSEIS to the 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS to address additional alternatives. The DSEIS has been issued with a 30-day comment period, after which, the
City will issue a Final SEIS responding to the comments. (See the Fact Sheet for information about the comment period and methods to provide comments.)

The SEIS alternatives under study include a similar increase in commercial development as the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action, but would locate all or a portion of this growth on different sites. Accordingly, the focus of the SEIS is on topics that can help City decision makers differentiate impacts among the original FEIS alternatives and DSEIS alternatives including:

- Land Use Patterns,
- Plans and Policies,
- Aesthetics, and
- Transportation.

While the 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS studied public services and utilities, these topics are not repeated in this SEIS. Because similar growth levels in similar locations are under consideration in Downtown, the overall results of the FEIS on these topics are not expected to significantly change. See Appendix A for additional information, including a memo on utilities.

Consistent with the SEPA Rules, this SEIS does not fully repeat the analysis of actions, alternatives, or impacts included in the 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS. A summary of the impacts of the prior 2008 Proposed Action, FEIS Review Alternative and No Action Alternative is included in Chapter 1 to allow comparison to the DSEIS alternatives. Similarly, Chapter 2 of this DSEIS summarizes the prior FEIS alternatives as well as the new DSEIS alternatives. Chapter 3 analyzes only the new DSEIS alternatives.

## 2.4 Description of the Alternatives

As described in Section 2.1.1, the Proposal includes the following three actions by the City.

- Allow for additional retail and office uses. Amend the City’s Comprehensive Plan and Zoning and Municipal Codes to allow for 954,000 additional square feet of retail and office uses in or adjacent to Downtown.

- Approve amendments to the City’s capital facilities and transportation elements to include all necessary capital improvements and a multiyear financing plan based on the 10-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan. This includes those improvements supporting the FEIS Review Alternative, which was the alternative selected for approval in 2008 in response to the Touchstone private amendment request application.

- Approve a Planned Action Ordinance to facilitate future environmental review of selected properties in Downtown, pursuant to Revised Code of Washington (RCW) 43.21C.031(2)(a) and WAC 197-11-164.

The City may also consider other implementing tools such as a development agreement with one or more property owners consistent with RCW 36.70B.170.

Each component of the Proposal is described in more detail below.
2.4.1  Land Use and Zoning Changes to Allow for Additional Retail and Office Uses

Superblock Alternative

The Superblock Alternative is bounded by Central Way on the north, 6th Street on the east, Kirkland Way on the south, and Peter Kirk Park on the west (Figure 2-2).

For purposes of the SEIS, the Superblock Alternative is considered an on-site alternative, which also includes some off-site development. In comparison to the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action, development amount, intensity, height, and bulk would be reduced on the Parkplace site and redistributed differently across the block. The growth on Parkplace alone would still increase above the No Action Alternative, but the increase would be approximately 482,000 square feet compared to 954,000 square feet considered in the 2008 FEIS. The non-Parkplace increase on the southern part of the Superblock would be a total of approximately 472,000 square feet. Table 2-1 shows generally how growth would be allocated to the northern and southern portion of the block.

The resulting floor area ratio (FAR) would equal 2.63. The FAR would increase above existing conditions and the No Action Alternative, but is less than the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action at 3.57.\(^2\) The resulting building heights would equal 4 to 6 stories across the block rather than the range of 4 to 8 stories studied with the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Lot Size Square Feet</th>
<th>Existing Buildings Square Feet (FAR 0.59)</th>
<th>No Action Alternative Development by 2022 Square Feet (FAR 1.38)</th>
<th>Superblock Alternative Square Feet (FAR 2.63)</th>
<th>Net Increase (Superblock minus No Action Alternative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Emerald</td>
<td>59,706</td>
<td>47,623</td>
<td>47,623</td>
<td>156,848</td>
<td>109,225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bungie</td>
<td>73,681</td>
<td>21,258</td>
<td>21,258</td>
<td>193,560</td>
<td>172,302</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace</td>
<td>502,848</td>
<td>238,450</td>
<td>838,700</td>
<td>1,320,982</td>
<td>482,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Watermark</td>
<td>35,438</td>
<td>57,192</td>
<td>57,192</td>
<td>93,096</td>
<td>35,904</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Continental</td>
<td>74,267</td>
<td>75,753</td>
<td>75,753</td>
<td>195,099</td>
<td>119,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>570</td>
<td>18,095</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>11,700</td>
<td>47,536</td>
<td>35,836</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>764,035</strong></td>
<td><strong>451,976</strong></td>
<td><strong>1,052,226</strong></td>
<td><strong>2,007,120</strong></td>
<td><strong>954,894</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^1\) Totals reflect rounding of fractional numbers.

Source: King County Assessor; City of Kirkland Planning Department; ICF International

\(^2\) The 2008 FEIS identified a FAR of 3.25 for the three sites studied at the time—Parkplace, Altom, and Orni. However, the figure of 3.57 is based on total building volume and parcel area for Parkplace alone.
Superblock Alternative

Source: City of Kirkland 2008, ICF 2010

Figure 2-2
The City has not received a specific application to develop the Superblock Alternative; the alternative has been developed for environmental review purposes and to allow consideration of a different way to distribute commercial growth Downtown. Property owner interest in redevelopment on the southern Superblock is unknown. If the City wished to implement the Superblock Alternative, it is anticipated that Comprehensive Plan text amendments would be required. Assuming the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and that FEIS Review Alternative Comprehensive Plan amendments are applied to the Superblock Alternative, the likely amendments would include the following:

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan to allow for taller buildings (up to 6 stories) in Downtown and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures.
- Remove the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street; rely on the Everest Neighborhood Plan with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of Interstate (I)-405.3
- Include a description in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan of how development is subject to design guidelines prepared for the Superblock. It is likely that the proposed Parkplace-specific master plan and design guidelines will be amended to address new height and bulk standards and will apply to the entire Superblock.
- Update the City's employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters of the plan.

In addition, amendments to the capital facilities and transportation elements would address improvements needed to meet City levels of service to accommodate additional growth in Downtown (see Section 2.4.2).

The Superblock Alternative would also entail text amendments to the 2008 Zoning Code similar to the CBD-5A zone associated with the 2008 FEIS Review Alternative, but the amendments would be applied to the full Superblock. Zoning amendments would also be required to modify building heights, setbacks, parking, percentage of retail (25% of office), open space connectivity, sustainability measures, pedestrian connections, and other standards to accomplish the anticipated growth.

Under this alternative, the City would amend the Kirkland Municipal Code to add a document entitled “Kirkland Superblock Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which would regulate the design of development; these design guidelines would be amended to address changes to height and bulk.

The planned action ordinance would be written to address development assumed on the whole Superblock, referencing mitigation measures from the 2008 FEIS and this DSEIS (see Section 2.4.3).

**Unified Ownership Alternative**

The Unified Ownership Alternative consists of two separate properties south of Central Way, the Parkplace site at 457 Central Way and the Post Office site located at 721 4th Avenue (Figure 2-3).
For purposes of the SEIS, the Unified Ownership Alternative is considered an on-site alternative, which also includes some off-site development. In comparison to the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action, development amount, height, and bulk would be reduced on the Parkplace site. The growth on the Parkplace site alone would still increase above the No Action Alternative, but the increase would be less at approximately 482,000 square feet instead of 954,000 square feet. The Post Office site would develop with an additional 472,000 square feet above the No Action Alternative. Table 2-2 shows generally how growth would be allocated between the two sites.

### Table 2-2. Unified Ownership Alternative Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Lot Size Square Feet</th>
<th>Existing Buildings Square Feet (FAR 0.4)</th>
<th>No Action Alternative Development by 2022 Square Feet (FAR 1.32)</th>
<th>Unified Ownership Alternative Square Feet (FAR 2.63-3.29)</th>
<th>Net Increase (Unified Ownership No Action Alternative)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace</td>
<td>502,848</td>
<td>238,450</td>
<td>838,700</td>
<td>1,320,982</td>
<td>482,282</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office</td>
<td>149,908</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>492,448</td>
<td>472,019</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>652,756</strong></td>
<td><strong>258,879</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>1,813,429</strong></td>
<td><strong>954,300</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 Totals reflect rounding of fractional numbers.

Source: King County Assessor; City of Kirkland Planning Department; ICF International

The resulting FAR would equal 2.63 on the Parkplace site and 3.29 on the Post Office site. The FAR increases above existing conditions and the No Action Alternative, but is less than the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action at 3.57\(^4\). The resulting building heights would equal 4 stories at the Parkplace site and 5 stories at the Post Office site, less than the range of 4 to 8 stories studied with the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action and FEIS Review Alternative on the Parkplace site alone.

The City has not received a specific application to consider the Unified Ownership Alternative. Similar to the other DSEIS Alternatives, it is an alternative created for environmental study and to show the effects of dispersing commercial growth in the Downtown area.

To accomplish the alternative, Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map amendments would be required for the Post Office site, though not for the Parkplace site:

- Amend the Comprehensive Plan map on the Post Office site to Commercial instead of Office.
- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan recognizing the Post Office site as Commercial rather than Office.

If the City wished to implement the Unified Ownership Alternative, it is anticipated that Comprehensive Plan text amendments would be required. Assuming the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and that FEIS Review Alternative Comprehensive Plan amendments are applied to the full Unified Ownership Alternative, the likely amendments would include the following:

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan to require interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures.

\(^4\) The 2008 FEIS identified a FAR of 3.25 for the three sites studied at the time—Parkplace, Altom, and Orni. However, the figure of 3.57 is based on total building volume and parcel area for Parkplace alone.
• Remove the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street; rely on the Everest Neighborhood Plan with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of I-405.  

• Include a description in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan of how development is subject to design guidelines prepared for Parkplace. It is likely that the proposed Parkplace-specific master plan and design guidelines will be amended to address different height and bulk standards on the Parkplace site and that the guidelines would be adapted to also apply to the Post Office site.

• Update the City's employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters of the plan.

In addition, amendments to the capital facilities and transportation elements would address improvements needed to meet City levels of service to accommodate additional growth in Downtown (see Section 2.4.2).

The Unified Ownership Alternative would also entail Zoning Code text amendments similar to the CBD-5A zone associated with the FEIS Review Alternative. Zoning amendments would also be required to modify building heights (to allow 70 feet instead of 60 feet in height), setbacks, parking, percentage of retail (25% of office), open space connectivity, sustainability measures, pedestrian connections, and other standards to accomplish the anticipated growth.

The planned action ordinance would be written to address modified development assumed on the Parkplace site, referencing mitigation measures from the 2008 FEIS and this DSEIS (see Section 2.4.3). Because the Post Office site is non-contiguous with Parkplace, it is assumed that a planned action ordinance would not be prepared for that site.

**Off-Site Alternative**

The Off-Site Alternative would spread an additional 954,000 square feet (the same increase associated with the 2008 FEIS Proposed Action) to multiple other sites in and near the Downtown including the Substation Block, CBD-7 Block, and CBD-1B Core Block (see Figure 2-4).

The growth on remaining blocks including Parkplace would not increase above No Action Alternative allowances. FARs would increase above the current zoning allowances to accommodate the additional growth on the study blocks (see Table 2-3).

---

5 This was removed with the 2008 FEIS Review Alternative and the actions taken to approve the Touchstone private amendment request in 2008; however, it is assumed that in comparison to the No Action Alternative, the Superblock Alternative would require the same action.
Figure 2-4
Off-site Alternative
### Table 2-3. Off-Site Alternative Statistics (Square Feet)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Site</th>
<th>Lot Size</th>
<th>Existing Buildings</th>
<th>No Action Development by 2022</th>
<th>Off-Site Alternative</th>
<th>Net Increase: Off-Site minus No Action</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substation Block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Car Wash</td>
<td>16,509</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>3,168</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>43,552</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Big O</td>
<td>16,509</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>3,644</td>
<td>46,720</td>
<td>43,076</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace North</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Primeau) 1</td>
<td>32,976</td>
<td>990</td>
<td>59,687</td>
<td>59,687</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PSE</td>
<td>30,662</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parking lot2</td>
<td>10,405</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>11,446</td>
<td>9,100</td>
<td>-2,346</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkade</td>
<td>43,602</td>
<td>23,383</td>
<td>23,383</td>
<td>133,567</td>
<td>110,184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Warehouse</td>
<td>21,552</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>11,900</td>
<td>71,165</td>
<td>59,265</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal3</strong></td>
<td>172,215</td>
<td>43,085</td>
<td>113,227</td>
<td>366,959</td>
<td>253,732</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBD-7 Block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White Swan</td>
<td>27,499</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>1,288</td>
<td>68,748</td>
<td>67,460</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>26,471</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>3,236</td>
<td>66,178</td>
<td>62,942</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wendy’s</td>
<td>5,319</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>13,298</td>
<td>13,298</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Elk Partners</td>
<td>14,316</td>
<td>8,116</td>
<td>8,116</td>
<td>35,790</td>
<td>27,674</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wells Fargo</td>
<td>50,894</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>5,130</td>
<td>127,235</td>
<td>122,105</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Crab Cracker</td>
<td>48,504</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>8,535</td>
<td>121,260</td>
<td>112,725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Them Vuong</td>
<td>5,400</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>4,502</td>
<td>13,500</td>
<td>8,998</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Shell</td>
<td>14,279</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>1,800</td>
<td>35,698</td>
<td>33,898</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal3</strong></td>
<td>192,682</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>481,705</td>
<td>449,098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBD 1B Core Block</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Antique Mall</td>
<td>38,465</td>
<td>9,261</td>
<td>9,261</td>
<td>109,241</td>
<td>99,980</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Peter Kirk Square</td>
<td>62,415</td>
<td>25,586</td>
<td>25,586</td>
<td>177,259</td>
<td>151,673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Subtotal3</strong></td>
<td>100,880</td>
<td>34,847</td>
<td>34,847</td>
<td>286,499</td>
<td>251,652</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total3</strong></td>
<td>465,777</td>
<td>110,539</td>
<td>180,681</td>
<td>1,135,164</td>
<td>954,483</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: King County Assessor; City of Kirkland Planning Department; ICF International

PSE = Puget Sound Energy

1 Assumes FAR consistent with building permit of 1.81.

2 Due to the unusual shape and proposed zoning setbacks, maximum size assumed is 9,100 square feet instead of 29,446 square feet if applying the FAR of 2.8. Square footage redistributed to lots associated with the parking lot, including the Parkade and Warehouse.

3 Totals round fractional numbers.

The City has not received a specific application to consider the Off-Site Alternative; the alternative was developed for environmental study and to show the effects of dispersing commercial growth within the Downtown area. It is unknown if property owners are interested in redevelopment aside from the Parkplace North site on the Substation Block which has received building permit approval. If the City wishes to implement the Off-Site Alternative, it is anticipated that Comprehensive Plan map and text amendments would be required similar to those of the FEIS Review Alternative. The likely amendments would include the following if considering the 2008 Comprehensive Plan:
- Amend the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan recognizing the Substation block as Commercial, or move the property from the Norkirk Neighborhood Plan to the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan, and address it as Commercial.

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan to allow for taller buildings (up to 6 stories) in Downtown and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures.

- Remove the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street; rely on the Everest Neighborhood Plan view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of I-405.  

- Update the City's employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters of the plan.

In addition, capital facilities element and transportation element amendments would be made addressing improvements needed to meet City levels of service considering amended growth in Downtown (see Section 2.4.2).

Zoning Map amendments would be made to apply the CBD-5A zone developed for the FEIS Review Alternative to the three blocks, but with variable FAR levels. Zoning text amendments would address building heights, setbacks, parking, percentage of retail (25% of office), open space connectivity, sustainability measures, pedestrian connections, and other standards to accomplish the growth anticipated under this alternative.

The Off-Site Alternative would not be designated as a Planned Action. It would be difficult as a practical matter, and unprecedented to apply a Planned Action to multiple noncontiguous blocks. None of the approximately 24 Planned Actions adopted in Washington to date has taken such an approach. Not adopting a Planned Action would not have any effect on environmental impacts or mitigation measures. However, it would eliminate the procedural incentive associated with a Planned Action (i.e., no SEPA threshold determinations at the project level) for the dispersed sites. Future developers would still be able to rely on and use the environmental analysis in the SEIS for their individual project review. Implementation would be more difficult for the City, as there would be multiple developers involved. Also, since the properties would not be developed according to a master plan, achieving coherent results would be more challenging. See Section 2.4.3 for more information.

**No Action Alternative**

While in 2008 the City approved CBD-5A zoning on the Parkplace portion of the Superblock, the purpose of this SEIS is to determine alternative locations for CBD-5A. The SEIS keeps a consistent No Action Alternative of CBD-5 since the City is considering different action alternatives. This DSEIS No Action Alternative is the same as the No Action Alternative studied in the 2008 FEIS. Data is presented in the SEIS to allow easier comparisons to a wider study area and additional sites considered in the SEIS. For the purposes of this DSEIS, the No Action Alternative assumes that the 2008 Comprehensive Plan and zoning regulations continue on the properties under review. Allowable land uses include a variety of commercial activities and in some cases light industrial.

---

6 This was removed with the FEIS Review Alternative and the actions taken to approve the Touchstone proposal in 2008; however, it is assumed that in comparison to the No Action Alternative, the Off-Site Alternative would require the same action.
Because City plans are directed toward the year 2022, the No Action Alternative assumes development likely to occur by that year considering 2008 City plans and policies, regional growth targets, and estimated locations for growth (Table 2-4).

### Table 2-4. No Action Alternative

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Study Area/Block</th>
<th>Present Uses</th>
<th>Current Building Square Feet</th>
<th>No Action Development by 2022</th>
<th>Difference</th>
<th>Current Zoning FAR</th>
<th>Current Maximum Zoning Building Height</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superblock</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace Site</td>
<td>Retail, Office</td>
<td>238,450</td>
<td>838,700</td>
<td>600,250</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Superblock</td>
<td>Office, Multifamily</td>
<td>213,526</td>
<td>213,526</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.59</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Post Office Site</strong></td>
<td>Post office and associated storage</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>1 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Site FAR</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>2.88</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Substation</strong></td>
<td>Commercial, Warehouse, Utilities</td>
<td>43,085</td>
<td>113,227</td>
<td>70,142</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.25</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>1.81</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBD-7</strong></td>
<td>Retail, Service, Club</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>32,607</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3 stories</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>0.17</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>CBD-1B Core</strong></td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>34,847</td>
<td>34,847</td>
<td>0</td>
<td></td>
<td>4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Block FAR</td>
<td></td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>0.35</td>
<td>2.25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Previous Alternatives Studied

The 2008 Downtown Area Planned Action FEIS addressed three alternatives: Proposed Action, FEIS Review Alternative, and No Action for the Parkplace site. The FEIS alternatives are summarized below. Additional descriptions and information about these alternatives are included in the 2008 FEIS.

### Proposed Action (2008 Touchstone PAR)

The Proposed Action in the 2008 FEIS would allow redevelopment of the Parkplace site, a retail and office complex located at 457 Central Way, with as much as 1.8 million square feet of office, retail, and hotel use. This alternative would also increase permissible building height from the currently allowed maximum of 3 to 5 stories to a maximum of 4 to 8 stories, allow increases in height within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park, reduce setbacks from 20 feet to 0 feet along Central Way and 6th Street, and reduce setbacks from 10 feet to 0 feet along Peter Kirk Park. Additional Zoning Code amendments associated with this request include revisions to lot coverage standards, parking requirements, and site planning requirements. Implementation of this request would result in a new zoning designation for this 11.5-acre area, CBD-5A.
FEIS Review Alternative (2008 Approved)

The 2008 FEIS Review Alternative lies within the range of the No Action and Proposed Action alternatives. It has the same development square footage as the Proposed Action. The details of Comprehensive Plan and zoning changes are more specific than the Proposed Action and described below. The 2008 FEIS Review Alternative was adopted in 2008 by the City.

The 2008 FEIS Review Alternative required the following changes to the Comprehensive Plan policies:

- Amend the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan consistent with mitigation measures identified in the DEIS to allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in CBD-5A and tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures in CBD-5A.
- Replace the view corridor identified in the Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan at the corner of Central Way and 6th Street with the view corridor at NE 85th Street just west of I-405.
- Include a description of how development in Parkplace is subject to design guidelines of the Master Plan and Design Guidelines for Kirkland Parkplace booklet.
- Update the City's employment capacity numbers in the Introduction and Land Use chapters of the plan.\(^7\)

The FEIS Review Alternative applied a new CBD-5A zone to:

- Allow for taller buildings (up to 8 stories) in a new zone called CBD-5A, but tie the additional height allowed to provision of interconnected public spaces, pedestrian-oriented development, retail streets, and sustainability measures.
- Require that development comply with the Parkplace Master Plan and Design Guidelines.
- Require that the amount of retail provided equal at least 25% of the office space provided in the development.
- Establish other land uses including hotel, athletic club, and movie theater as allowed uses subject to conditions.
- Prohibit retail establishments from exceeding 70,000 square feet; at-grade drive-through facilities; and outdoor storage, sale, service and/or rental of motor vehicles, sailboats, motor boats, and recreational trailers.
- Establish four height districts in CBD-5A with lower heights to the north and west and up to 115 feet maximum height, equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action. These height districts would reduce heights in specific locations as follows:
  - Up to 60 feet in height within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park;
  - Transitional height area of up to 100 feet between 100 feet and 120 feet of Peter Kirk Park; and
  - Up to 100 feet in height within 100 feet of Central Way.

\(^7\) While these amendments were identified with the FEIS Review Alternative, the City did not adopt updates to capacity numbers in 2008. These amendments are under consideration in 2010.
• Require submittal of a study to justify parking less than required in the Zoning Code based on shared use and inclusion of a transportation management plan (TMP) and parking management plan (PMP) as part of the parking reduction study.

• Establish specific setback and upper-story setback requirements based on location, which are either consistent with or more restrictive than those of the Proposed Action:
  o **Central Way.** No setbacks along Central Way and 6th Street;
  o **Peter Kirk Park.** A 55-foot minimum setback adjacent to the park; and
  o **South/southeast boundary.** A 20-foot minimum setback along the south portion of the area adjacent to the existing office and residential uses.

• Provide pedestrian connections as outlined in the existing *Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan.*

• Establish a network of streets, sidewalks, and open spaces connecting Parkplace with adjoining streets and developments.

• Provide a large, central open space.

• Require that building(s) south of the central open space be terraced\(^8\) to allow for sun to reach 50% of the open space at 2:00 p.m. on March 21 and September 21.

In addition to creating a new CBD-5A zone as described above, the FEIS Review Alternative included additional amendments to the Kirkland Municipal Code to add a document entitled “Kirkland Parkplace Mixed Use Development Master Plan and Design Guidelines” which regulates the design of development on the Parkplace site as described under the FEIS Review Alternative above.

The FEIS Review Alternative identified transportation improvements that would be needed to support the redevelopment of the Parkplace site. See Section 2.4.2 which describes the Capital Facility and Transportation Element amendments that describe the improvements and a funding plan.

**No Action Alternative (2008 Parkplace Site)**

Redevelopment and growth would be limited to what is allowed under the current City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan and Zoning Code. The No Action Alternative assumed an increased level of office and retail development that City staff estimated could occur within the existing land use regulations of the CBD-5A zone. The CBD-5A zone allows for a mixture of uses including office, retail, and residential uses in a mixed-use environment supporting Downtown. The zone allows buildings of 3 to 5 stories above average building elevation, subject to specific conditions and requirements. This zone requires a 20-foot front setback with no required side and rear setbacks. There is a special requirement for Peter Kirk Park, which has a minimum required setback of 10 feet that may be reduced to 0 feet for those portions of buildings with continuous retail or restaurant uses at street level. Development in this zone must be physically integrated both in area and building design. Area design must include installation of pedestrian linkages consistent with major pedestrian routes in the Downtown Plan chapter of the Comprehensive Plan.

\(^8\) When adopted, the design guidelines indicated that the building to the south of the central plaza will be designed so that it is under a 41 degree angle measured from the center of the plaza.
Comparison of Alternatives

All alternatives studied in the 2008 FEIS and in this DSEIS allow for additional growth, though to different degrees. Future growth under all of the action alternatives is greater than the No Action Alternative.

All action alternatives assume approximately 954,000 square feet of additional employment growth in Downtown, some on a single site and some distributed to multiple locations. Redistributing growth to the Superblock has the effect of reducing the FAR on the Parkplace site; accordingly height and bulk would be reduced below that studied with the FEIS Proposed Action or FEIS Review Alternative. The same is true of the Unified Ownership Alternative.

The No Action Alternative assumes little change on the three blocks that comprise the SEIS Off-Site Alternative. As a result, there is relatively greater capacity for additional employment growth spread over the three blocks which results in a FAR that is lower still than the other action alternatives (see Table 2-5 on following page).

2.4.2 Amend Capital Facilities and Transportation Elements

The City is proposing amendments to its capital facilities and transportation elements of its Comprehensive Plan to include all necessary capital improvements and a multiyear financing plan based on the 10-year transportation needs identified in the Comprehensive Plan. The amendments include capital improvements associated with a Totem Lake Mall redevelopment that has been the subject of a developer agreement, and improvements associated with the 2008 FEIS Review Alternative (related to the Touchstone proposal to redevelop the Parkplace site). The Totem Lake Mall redevelopment improvements have already been reviewed in prior SEPA documents (see Section2.3.1). The 2008 FEIS Review Alternative was reviewed in the 2008 EIS, to which this DSEIS is a supplement. The proposed amendments to the City’s Comprehensive Plan are included in DSEIS Appendix B. In summary, the proposed amendments would:

- Amend Table CF-8 in the capital facilities element showing 6-year funding and projects. The portion of the table showing funded projects will add the Totem Lake and Parkplace projects in the appropriate years.

- Create a new table in the capital facilities element (CF-8A) showing a financing plan for an additional 4 years of projects, creating a 10-year list. The proposed table is organized like Table CF-8 showing revenues in one segment and projects in another. The table shows categories of projects. Specific projects will be added to the 6-year list each year, as determined necessary for maintaining adopted levels of service.

- Amend the transportation element in several instances to reference the “multiyear finance plan.” Projects as noted in the capital facilities element amendments would be added to Table T-5 and Figure T-6.
### Table 2-5. Comparison of FEIS and DSEIS Alternatives—Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Alternative</th>
<th>Square Footage</th>
<th>FAR</th>
<th>Maximum Building Stories</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>No Action Alternative</strong>¹</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace Site Alone</td>
<td>838,700</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Superblock as a Whole</td>
<td>1,052,226</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Site Alone</td>
<td>20,429</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace and Post Office Total</td>
<td>859,129</td>
<td>1.32</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation, CBD-7, CBD-1B Core Blocks</td>
<td>180,681</td>
<td>0.66</td>
<td>3–5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Action Alternatives</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 Proposed Action: Parkplace Site Alone</td>
<td>1,792,700</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4–8 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference with No Action Alternative</td>
<td>954,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2008 FEIS Review Alternative: Parkplace Site Alone</td>
<td>1,792,700</td>
<td>3.57</td>
<td>4–8 stories²</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference with No Action Alternative</td>
<td>954,000</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 3 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Superblock Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace</td>
<td>1,320,982</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Southern Superblock</td>
<td>686,138</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>5–6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Superblock Alternative</td>
<td>1,949,726</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4-6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference with No Action Alternative</td>
<td>954,894</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 1 story</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Unified Ownership Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Parkplace Site</td>
<td>1,320,982</td>
<td>2.63</td>
<td>4 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Post Office Site</td>
<td>492,448</td>
<td>3.29</td>
<td>5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Unified Ownership Alternative</td>
<td>1,813,429</td>
<td>2.78</td>
<td>4-5 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference with No Action Alternative</td>
<td>954,300</td>
<td></td>
<td>+0 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(code amendment to allow 70 ft height)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Off-Site Alternative</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Substation, CBD-7, CBD-1B Core Blocks</td>
<td>1,135,164</td>
<td>2.44 (range 0.87-3.3)</td>
<td>3–6 stories</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference with No Action Alternative</td>
<td>954,483</td>
<td></td>
<td>+ 2 stories</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SF = square feet

¹ There is only one No Action Alternative. However statistics vary by block and site. Thus to compare to the action alternatives that consider different locations, the No Action Alternative results are broken out by location.

² Standards are equivalent to the 8-story maximum height discussed in the Proposed Action, and varied near Peter Kirk Park and Central Way:
- Up to 115 feet in CBD-5A zone with following exceptions:
  - Up to 60 feet in height within 100 feet of Peter Kirk Park,
  - Transitional height area of up to 100 feet between 100 feet and 120 feet of Peter Kirk Park; and
  - Up to 100 feet within 100 feet of Central Way.
2.4.3 Adopt a Planned Action Ordinance

The City is considering applying a planned action ordinance to the 2008 Proposed Action, 2008 FEIS Review Alternative, the Parkplace portion of the DSEIS Unified Ownership Alternative, and DSEIS Superblock Alternative. According to WAC 197-11-164, a Planned Action is defined as a project that has the following characteristics:

- is designated a Planned Action by ordinance;
- has had significant environmental impacts addressed in an EIS;
- has been prepared in conjunction with a Comprehensive Plan, subarea plan, master planned development, a phased project, or with subsequent or implementing projects of any of these categories;
- is located within an urban growth area;
- is not an essential public facility; and
- is consistent with an adopted Comprehensive Plan.

When a permit application and environmental checklist are submitted for a project that is being proposed as a Planned Action project, the City must first verify that:

- the project meets the description of any project(s) designated as a Planned Action by ordinance or resolution;
- the probable significant adverse environmental impacts were adequately addressed in the EIS; and
- the project includes any conditions or mitigation measures outlined in the ordinance or resolution.

If the project meets the above requirements, the project qualifies as a Planned Action project and a SEPA threshold determination is not required. However, the following City actions are still applicable:

- The project must continue through the City's permit process pursuant to any notices and other requirements contained in the City's development regulations.
- The project must be analyzed for consistency with the City's zoning and development regulations.
- Designation of a Planned Action project does not limit the City from using other authority (e.g., conditional use permit) to place conditions on a project. The City may still use applicable laws or regulations to impose conditions on a project qualifying as a Planned Action project.
- Public notice for a Planned Action project is tied to the underlying permit. If notice is required for the underlying permit, then the notice will indicate that the project qualifies as a Planned Action.

---

9 The City adopted a planned action ordinance in 2008 associated with the FEIS Review Alternative. As a result of considering new alternatives in this DSEIS, the City may wish to amend or readopt the planned action ordinance. For example, the City could decide to amend the planned action ordinance to apply it to the whole Superblock.
As described in Section 2.4.1, the DSEIS Off-Site Alternative would not be designated as a Planned Action. Not adopting a Planned Action would not have any effect on environmental impacts or mitigation measures. However, it would eliminate the procedural incentive associated with a Planned Action (i.e., no SEPA threshold determinations at the project level) for the dispersed sites. Future developers would still be able to rely on and use the environmental analysis in the SEIS for their individual project review.

2.4.4 Other Implementation Tools

The City will likely use a range of tools to implement one or another alternative. These tools include its existing plans, policies and development regulations, and conditions of approval or agreements that are specific to an individual development proposal. The City will consider use of a development agreement, as authorized by RCW 36.70B.170, or a similar mechanism, to ensure the provision and financing of necessary transportation improvements, and to impose appropriate development conditions. Adoption of a development agreement requires a public hearing and action by the City Council.

2.5 Benefits and Disadvantages of Delaying a Proposed Action

Delaying implementation of the Proposal under any of the action alternatives would delay the occurrence of potential impacts identified in this DSEIS, including potential land use conflicts, changes to visual character, and increased traffic congestion. Positive impacts would also be delayed. Additional employment opportunities would not be added to City plans and codes. Delay would not allow new development and associated review processes to fully benefit from the analysis developed through this Planned Action process, including mitigation measures.

2.6 Major Issues to Be Resolved

Adoption of City of Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map, Zoning Map, and Zoning Code amendments to allow increased structure heights and reduced setbacks in and near Downtown would support development and redevelopment of the area to a more intensive mixed-use character and support employment growth in Downtown consistent with the vision of the Comprehensive Plan. The key environmental issues facing decision makers are the alternative distribution of traffic trips, adequate parking in the area, transit service and facilities to meet demand, potential land use conflicts, changes to visual character resulting from increased building heights, impact of increased building heights on public view corridors, and mitigating measures to address all such impacts.