



CITY OF KIRKLAND
Planning and Community Development Department
123 Fifth Avenue, Kirkland, WA 98033 425.587.3225
www.kirklandwa.gov

MEMORANDUM

DATE: September 12, 2014

TO: Planning Commission
Houghton Community Council

FROM: Jon Regala, Senior Planner
Jeremy McMahan, Planning Supervisor

SUBJECT: AMENDMENTS TO MULTI-FAMILY PARKING REQUIREMENTS - DELIBERATIONS
FILE NO. CAM13-02032

I. **RECOMMENDATION**

A. **Houghton Community Council**

- At its September 22, 2014 meeting, deliberate on the proposed Kirkland Zoning Code (KZC) amendments to multi-family parking requirements within the disapproval jurisdiction of the Community Council and make a recommendation to the Planning Commission for their consideration.

B. **Planning Commission**

- At its September 25, 2014 meeting, receive the Houghton Community Council recommendation on those KZC amendments within their jurisdiction.
- Deliberate on the proposed KZC amendments to multi-family parking requirements and make a recommendation to the City Council for their consideration.

II. **BACKGROUND**

- A. **Project Goal.** The goal of this project is to bring Kirkland's multi-family parking requirements in line with actual parking demand. The City's current standard of 1.7 stalls/unit plus up to an additional 0.5 stalls/unit for visitor parking has remained unchanged for at least 20 years except for Downtown Kirkland and certain business districts in Totem Lake and North Rose Hill. The basis for the City's current general multi-family parking requirement is not clear.

In July 2013, the City applied to be included as a part of a pilot project under King County's Right Size Parking (RSP) project. In August 2013, Kirkland was one of four cities selected to participate. The benefit is that the City has received technical support from the County's RSP project team to assist in the code amendment process.

- B. **Public Hearing.** The Planning Commission conducted a joint public hearing with the Houghton Community Council on August 28, 2014 regarding this project. The public hearing included presentations by Fehr & Peers and staff on the proposed amendments, public comment, and an opportunity for questions and comments by each Commissioner and Community Council member. Sections II.C through II.K, below, respond to specific comments and questions raised by the Commission and Community Council.

At the conclusion, the hearing was closed except that written public comments were allowed to be submitted until the Planning Commission deliberation meeting to be held on September 25, 2014. See also Section III – Public Comment below.

The meeting packet provided for the [public hearing](#) should be referred to for all background information on the proposed amendments to multi-family parking requirements. Please bring this packet to the deliberation meeting for your reference. The packet can also be accessed online at:

http://www.kirklandwa.gov/depart/planning/Boards_and_Commissions/Planning_Commission.htm

In addition, a revised draft on the visitor parking requirement is included as an attachment to this memorandum based on the Planning Commission's comments at the public hearing (see Attachment 1 and Subsection II.F below). The revised draft should replace the version reviewed at the public hearing.

- C. **Public Benefits/Incentives.** As mentioned earlier, the project goal was simply to determine if parking code adjustments were needed to better match parking supply with demand. The project goal was not to create an incentive-based approach or public benefit trade-off with lowering parking requirements for multi-family development.

The City does currently have in place other policy-based incentives as it relates to parking requirements. The following parking reduction incentives are currently allowed by the KZC:

KZC Section 105.34 Covered Bicycle Storage - If covered and secured bicycle storage is provided on site, a credit towards parking requirements at a ratio of one (1) less parking stall per six (6) bicycle spaces will be granted. The Planning Official may increase credits according to size of development and anticipated pedestrian and bicycle activity and proximity to transit facilities. A maximum reduction of five (5) percent of required parking stalls may be granted. If a reduction of five (5) or more stalls is granted, then changing facilities including showers, lockers shall be required.

KZC Section 112.20.4.b Affordable Housing Incentives – The required parking may be reduced to 1.0 space per affordable housing unit. No additional guest parking is required for affordable housing units. If parking is reduced through this provision, the owner of the affordable housing unit shall sign a covenant, in a form acceptable to the City Attorney, restricting the occupants of each affordable housing unit to a maximum of one (1) automobile.

In the attached draft code amendments, an additional parking reduction incentive is being considered for certain multi-family projects located close to the Downtown Transit Center (see Attachment 1 and Section II.E below).

- D. **King County Data.** The following is an excerpt from the public hearing staff memo dated August 21, 2014 on the topic that four properties with 100% parking utilization were not included in the King County RSP data analysis:

It was mentioned that several properties, found to have 100% parking utilization during the residential peak parking period, were not included in the King County RSP analysis and model. After following up with Daniel Rowe with King County METRO, it turns out that a total of four properties were removed from the study since there was no way to determine if utilization was a result of supply perfectly matching demand or if parking was being undersupplied or underpriced. The decision on this methodology came from King County METRO's Methods Review

Committee (made up of national academics and practitioners) at the beginning of the project.

Two of the projects were urban affordable housing projects with very low parking supply. The other two projects were suburban projects, one smaller project in Woodinville and a larger project in Bellevue. According to King County METRO, removal of these four projects had very little, if any impact on the data analysis considering the remaining sample size (over 220 sites) was still very large.

The goal of the data collection process was to include sites where accurate parking demand data could be obtained. The four sites described above were not included as a result of the project teams' data collection methodology. Excluding the sites reflected the best practices of experts in the field to accurately determine parking demand and statistically has very little to no impact on the data analysis. Staff confirmed that 226 sites were included as part of the King County RSP data analysis.

- E. **Parking Reductions and Frequent Transit.** City-wide parking reductions, when close to frequent transit, are not included in the draft amendments except for multi-family developments within ½ mile of the Downtown Kirkland Transit Center (see Attachment 1). This is consistent with the direction previously given by the Planning Commission and Houghton Community Council. The proposed code amendments on this topic are based on Comprehensive Plan policies that support compact development and multi-modal transportation options rather than actual parking utilization data relative to location of transit. The Downtown transit center and affected properties are not located within the Houghton Community Council's jurisdiction.
- F. **Visitor Parking.** To clarify that visitor parking is being required in addition to the base number of required parking spaces for residential tenants, staff has revised the proposed text to read as follows (see Attachment 1 for the complete redline version):

KZC Section 105.20.3 – In addition to required parking for medium and high-density residential uses, visitor parking shall be required as follows:...

G. **Redmond & Bellevue Downtown Parking Requirements**

Below is background information on Redmond and Bellevue's downtown parking requirements relative to their respective general multi-family parking requirements.

Redmond. Redmond's urban center (Downtown and Overlake) multi-family parking requirement is lower than their general requirement. Their general multi-family parking requirement is:

- 1.2 stalls/studio
- 1.5 stalls/one-bedroom
- 1.8 stalls/two-bedrooms
- 2.0 stalls/three+ bedrooms

In contrast, Redmond's urban center multi-family parking requirement is a minimum 1.0 stall/unit and a maximum of 2.25 stalls/unit, plus 0.25 stall per unit for guest parking for projects with 6 units or more. Curbside parking along the site may count towards up to 25% of required off-street parking. Parking may be provided in excess of the maximum requirement if the stalls are made available to the general public at all times. In their Downtown, Redmond has approved parking requirements as low as 0.94 stalls/unit through their parking modification process, which requires a parking analysis by a qualified transportation consultant.

Bellevue. Bellevue's general multi-family parking requirements is:

- 1.2 stalls/studio & one-bedroom
- 1.6 stalls/two-bedroom
- 1.8 stalls/three-bedroom.

In Bellevue's Downtown zones, the minimum parking requirement for residential units ranges from zero to 1 stall/unit with a maximum of 2 stalls/unit. Bellevue's Bel-Red zones minimum multi-family parking requirements vary from 0.75 to 1 stall/unit depending on the zoning district with a maximum of 2 stalls/unit.

The Bel-Red section of the code does have the ability for the director to modify the minimum or maximum parking ratio. This can be done through an actual parking demand study for the proposed use, providing evidence of other planning or technical studies related to the proposed use, or documentation from a comparable jurisdiction of required parking for the same use. In Bellevue's Downtown, only the maximum parking limitation may be modified.

- H. **Sunset Clause**. A member of the Houghton Community Council asked if there was a sunset clause associated with this project since it was previously referred to as being a 'pilot project'. To clarify, Kirkland was selected by King County METRO to be one of several projects that would apply the County's Right Size Parking research and findings to real-world scenarios. In return, King County would provide their expertise and resources to support the participating jurisdiction through the code amendment process. That part of King County's federally funded project was called a 'pilot project'. The proposed Kirkland Code amendments have not been intended as a pilot project. Therefore there is no sunset clause associated with Kirkland's project to update its multi-family parking requirements.
- I. **Garden Style Projects**. Several members requested another look at the parking data to see if a relationship could be found between smaller 'garden style' projects and parking utilization. For purposes of this topic, Fehr & Peers looked at the existing parking utilization data for developments with less than 50 units and compared it with larger developments (51+ units). Fehr & Peers could not determine definitively if these smaller developments had any different parking characteristics than larger developments. Statistically, the smaller developments were generally found to have a lower parking utilization rate than the larger developments (0.86 stalls/unit versus 0.99 stalls/unit). Fehr & Peers notes that many of the smaller developments, tended to have more units as affordable units and that the rents are lower, both of which tend to reduce parking utilization. The sample size available, which included the Kirkland sites, was small (37 sites) and, as a result, proved difficult to conclude anything definitively.
- J. **Downtown Kirkland Parking Assessment Project**. Public Works is currently working on a project that seeks to understand and evaluate how parking is used in Downtown Kirkland based on a review of existing information and stakeholder interviews. The project includes also includes identifying potential sites for additional public parking and parking way-finding recommendations. The project does not include undertaking new parking demand/utilization studies in the Downtown so will not inform the current discussion. The final report from the consultant is expected sometime in October. Attachment 2 describes the project scope in more detail. Questions regarding this project can be directed to David Godfrey, Transportation Engineering Manager at dgodfrey@kirklandwa.gov or (425) 587-3865.

- K. **Household Population.** The table below shows Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) information regarding the average number of persons per household in Kirkland, based on household type.

OFM – Kirkland Population Review Worksheet (April 2014)

Type of Structure	Persons Per Household	Occupancy Rate	Persons per Household based on Occupancy Rate
1 Unit (single-family)	2.724350	0.955323	2.602634
2 Units	1.750511	0.963395	1.686434
3 & 4 Units	2.030359	0.966040	1.961408
5+ Units	1.712849	0.917393	1.571356
Mobile Homes/Trailers	3.311688	0.903526	2.992196

This information shows that throughout Kirkland, the average multi-family household within developments that have five or more units contains approximately 1.71 persons/unit. Adjusted for occupancy rates of a development, the number of persons/unit lowers to 1.57. The information does not contain details on demographics such as the age of occupants.

III. PUBLIC COMMENT

At the conclusion of the public hearing, the Planning Commission left the record open for written public comment until its deliberation meeting on September 25, 2014. A number of public comment emails were received after the public hearing and prior to the distribution of this memo. These emails have been included in Attachment 3. Public comment received after the distribution of this memo will be provided at the deliberation meeting.

IV. ATTACHMENTS

1. Revised Code Language
2. Downtown Parking Assessment - Scope of Work
3. Public Comment

PROPOSED CODE AMENDMENTS
FILE NO. CAM13-02032

In addition to required parking for medium and high-density residential uses, visitor parking shall be required as follows:

KZC Section 105.20 Number of Parking Spaces – Minimum

1. The number of parking spaces required for a use is the minimum required. The applicant shall provide at least that number of spaces, consistent with the provisions of this chapter. If the required formula for determining the number of parking spaces results in a fraction, the applicant shall provide the number of spaces equal to the next higher whole number.
2. The square footage of pedestrian, transit, and/or bicycle facilities, and/or garages or carports, on the subject property shall not be included in the gross floor area calculation used to determine required number of parking stalls. ~~See also KZC 105.103(3)(c).~~
3. ~~For medium and high-density residential uses, guest parking spaces are required as follows:~~
 - A. A minimum 10% of the total number of required parking spaces, calculated prior to any parking reductions, shall be provided for visitor parking and located in a common area accessible by visitors.
 - B. A detached or attached dwelling unit with an associated garage containing its required number of parking stalls is excluded from the visitor parking calculation required in subsection A above provided that the dwelling unit also has a driveway that meets the parking stall dimensional standards of this chapter and the driveway can be used to provide visitor parking for that dwelling unit.
 - C. Visitor parking stalls shall not be leased or assigned to residents.
 - D. Visitor parking stalls shall not be gated and be accessible by visitors between 6:00 a.m. and 11:00 p.m.
4. The number of required parking stalls for a development consisting of for-rent detached, attached, and/or stacked dwelling units may be reduced by 15% if the subject property is located within ½ mile of the Downtown Kirkland Transit Center and the City approves a Parking Covenant for the development. The ½ mile distance shall be determined by taking the shortest walk route from the subject property to the Downtown Kirkland Transit Center as measured along public walkways. The property owner shall submit the Parking Covenant on a form approved by the City for recording with King County. The Parking Covenant shall be binding on all future owners and assignees and include the following requirements:
 - A. The owner to provide two-zone bus passes or equivalent alternative transportation mode subsidy in an amount equal to the number of reduced parking stalls. The owner shall provide to the City a plan for review and approval that specifies the distribution of the bus passes or equivalent subsidy. Preference on transit subsidy distribution shall be to driving age residents that do not have cars.
 - B. Provide one secured and sheltered bicycle parking space for each unit in the development. The parking reductions allowed in KZC Section 105.34 – Covered Bicycle Storage cannot be used if the parking reduction described in this section is being applied.
 - C. Designation of a Transportation Coordinator to manage the Parking Covenant, distribution of the two-zone bus pass or equivalent subsidy, provide commute information to all new residents, and be a point of contact for residents and the City.

- D. All required parking within a project shall be under common ownership and management.
- E. Prohibition on the conversion of the property to a condominium unless the number of required parking stalls are provided as calculated prior to the transit related reduction allowed by this section.
- F. Acknowledgement by the property owner that it shall be a violation of this code to fail to comply with the provisions of the Parking Covenant.

Delete the following KZC Section and move into KZC Section 105.20.1 above.

~~105.30 Number of Parking Spaces—Fractions~~

~~If the required formula for determining the number of parking spaces results in a fraction, the applicant shall provide the number of spaces equal to the next higher whole number.~~

Changes to Parking Modification Text – KZC 105.103.3.c

For a modification to KZC 105.20 and 105.45, a decrease in the required number of spaces may be granted if the number of spaces proposed is documented by an adequate and thorough parking demand and utilization study to be sufficient to fully serve the use. The study shall be prepared by a licensed transportation engineer or other qualified professional, and shall analyze the operational characteristics of the proposed use which justify a parking reduction. The scope of the study shall be proposed by the transportation engineer and approved by the City traffic engineer. The study shall provide at least two (2) days of data for morning, afternoon and evening hours, or as otherwise approved or required by the City traffic engineer. Approval of a parking reduction shall be solely at the discretion of the City. A decrease in the minimum required number of spaces may be based in whole or part on the provision of nationally accepted TDM (transportation demand management) measures. Data supporting the effectiveness of the TDM measures shall be provided as part of the parking demand and utilization study and approved by the City traffic engineer.

For multi-family parking modifications, the parking demand rate result shall be increased by 15% to account for the variation in multi-family parking demand and shall be subject to the visitor parking requirements in KZC Section 105.20.3.

The Planning Official shall not approve or deny a modification to decrease the number of parking spaces without first providing notice of the modification request to the owners and residents of property within 300 feet of the subject property and providing opportunity for comment. The Planning Official shall use mailing labels provided by the applicant, or, at the discretion of the Planning Official, by the City. Said comment period shall not be less than seven (7) calendar days.

Attachment A Consultant Scope

Task 1: Understand and assess parking services currently delivered by the City of Kirkland. This will entail a brief and accurate overview of principal strengths, areas for improvements and resulting needs. Information gathered in this Task will be used to inform recommendations in Tasks 2 through 5. Information will be gathered through a site visit, review of existing documents, reports and/or data summaries provided to the Consultant by the City. The Consultant will also conduct up to 8 interviews of key non-City staff stakeholders as identified by the Consultant and the City, on parking issues, challenges and opportunities in the downtown. Interviews will be structured using a question outline developed by the Consultant and approved by the City. Preference will be given to conducting interviews in person, but may need to be conducted by phone due to scheduling conflicts. Up to 8 Additional interviews will be conducted with staff from the City Manager, Finance, Planning, Police, Public Works and Planning Departments.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum #1: Existing Conditions, Challenges and Opportunities.

Task 2: Evaluate applications of new technology from up to 5 different vendors for their appropriateness to Kirkland. These would include systems that implement web-based parking solutions that are vertically integrated from users finding available stalls, through payment, data collection, enforcement and ticket payment. Discuss integration into Kirkland's ITS system. Make recommendations for next steps. Systems that display the number of available stalls for a particular parking facility will also be evaluated. These displays may be at the facility, or located remotely.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum #2: Parking Technologies Appropriate to Downtown Kirkland.

Task 3: Perform pro-forma evaluations on the financial viability of development of additional public parking supply on up to 3 different sites in downtown Kirkland. The Consultant will work with the City to identify site locations and square footages associated with hypothetical development pad sizes and assumptions of stall totals.

Describe funding options involving nearby property owners, pay parking customers, general city revenue and any other viable funding sources. Evaluate the feasibility of partnering with developers to provide added public parking. Make recommendations.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum #3: Parking Development Pro-forma Summary

Task 4: Evaluate parking wayfinding on-street and in city owned facilities and recommend improvements.

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum #4: Summary Recommendations for Downtown Parking Wayfinding.

Task 5: Evaluate options for increased parking supply. Consultant will evaluate and make recommendations for the following areas:

- Partnerships with up to 3 private property owners
- Removal of permit parking on Lake Avenue West
- Implementation of time limited parking

Deliverable: Technical Memorandum #5: Summary Recommendations for additional parking supply

Task 6: Final written report.

Includes up to two drafts for City review and comment and one Final Report.

Task 7: Additional services as necessary to investigate, analyze and report on items either not covered in Tasks 1 through 6 or which need more resources.

Jon Regala

From: DougRough@aol.com
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 3:05 PM
To: Jon Regala
Cc: ken.albinger@casne.com; patrick.fitzgerald.st2s@statefarm.com;
amanda.rough@live.com
Subject: Notes from JNA meeting

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Jon,

Thank you for taking the time to present on the proposed multi-family parking zoning change. Here are my notes.

At the Juanita Neighborhoods Association's September general meeting at Juanita Elementary Monday night, residents rejected the idea, by a vote of 24 to zero, of changing the zoning for multifamily building if it means lowering the number of required parking spaces. Jon Regala gave a presentation on the methodology used by the City of Kirkland to recommend changes to the parking requirements for multi-family dwellings while Doug Rough, co-chair of the Juanita Neighborhoods Association, spoke briefly about the issues associated with reducing parking requirements, including peak time (festivals, garage sales, etc.) congestion, reduced metro transit routes in Kirkland, and apparent problems with the study methodology.

One of my issues with the methodology, and correct me if I am wrong, is lack of accounting for overages. For example, imagine a bus with 50 seats, 48 filled and two open seats, with 20 people standing, and 32 people left at the last bus stop. I have been on a bus like this, where the standing folks do not see the open two seats in the back. By your methodology, you would say that the demand for this bus was 48, rather than 100 (48+20+32=100). In other words, by only counting the cars in parking spaces at an apartment building, you do not capture the total demand for parking. I realize that you have this "15% adjustment" but I do not think that fully captures the undercount. Similarly, whatever data you used cannot include the loss of two major Kirkland metro routes, 238 and 277, which will happen in October. The effect on parking cannot be known yet and as such was not captured. (I hope the metro folks have not used this methodology to justify their route reductions!)

--Doug Rough 425-821-5529 www.RoughHouse.org -- www.RetreatsAndReunions.com

Jon Regala

From: Eric Shields
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 2:42 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: FW: Proposed Parking decrease for multi-units

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Eric Shields

From: Camille Diclerico [mailto:cbdiclerico@frontier.com]
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 12:23 AM
To: Planning Commissioners
Cc: Camille
Subject: Proposed Parking decrease for multi-units

Tonight I sat thru a Juanita Neighborhood Association meeting and one presentation was about decreasing the number of parking spaces for multi-unit housing. Not a great idea. You should be increasing it not decreasing it. I heard a lot about number of bedrooms per unit. I'm more interested in number of occupants per unit. It is not uncommon for a one bedroom unit to have two occupants – with 2 cars. How can you possibly squeeze 2 cars into 1.4 spaces? Two bedrooms – 2 – 4 occupants etc. So why would you decrease the amount of parking? It should be increased to a minimum of 2 parking sites for one bedroom units – and then upwards for more bedrooms.

Need I remind you of the fiasco at Juanita Village – a mixed use residential and commercial area? Not enough parking for residents/certainly not enough parking for shoppers & employees/definitely not enough parking for guests of residents...a traffic nightmare created by the city of Kirkland. Residential/commercial mixed use is by far a great way to go – able to walk to services etc...but the parking needs to reflect that. I've pretty much stopped shopping there – never any parking. Sometimes I do walk the 1.25 miles there from my home for the exercise – but certainly can't tote my packages home – so I don't buy.

Instead of being a follower of a flawed study be a leader of the community and actually look at what is going on. Camille DiClerico

Jon Regala

From: Eric Shields
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 2:55 PM
To: Jon Regala; Jeremy McMahan
Subject: FW: Please reconsider your linking of multi-family parking and CBD parking
Attachments: Glen Buhlmann.vcf

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

FYI

[Eric Shields](#)

From: Glen Buhlmann [mailto:glenbu@exchange.microsoft.com]
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Planning Commissioners; Houghton Council
Cc: Eric Shields; Kurt Triplett; Amy Walen; Penny Sweet
Subject: Please reconsider your linking of multi-family parking and CBD parking

These are separate issues and while they are related they can and should be addressed separately.

Our street network is not safe for people. Not for people in cars and definitely not for people on foot, on bicycle or in wheelchairs. If Kirkland continues to implement a lack of data-backed planning and sets high parking minimums like your groups are proposing then this will not get better. Traffic congestion will get worse. Pedestrian safety will get worse. Bicyclist safety will get worse.

Please don't use anecdotal, and completely disprovable by hard data, comments like Councilmember Brian Gawthrop's comment that people won't take transit or ride bicycles in the winter be used to make your decisions. You have a lot of data available to you that the city has already collected which shows what the public views on these issues are. Ask Eric Shields to dig up all the feedback the city has received in its Park Lane outreach. A vast majority of Kirkland residents (my off the cuff estimate from having seen the data at the public events as it is being collected would be somewhere in the range of 75-80%) want Park Lane closed off to cars permanently. This means removing these 37 or 38 CBD parking spots. You can't argue that the residents of Kirkland are asking for the crazy high parking minimums that you are proposing solely due to CBD parking problems.

If you want to see a recent example of how parking policies impact safety you need look no further than the young woman on a bicycle killed on 2nd Ave in Seattle this morning. Or the teen killed in Kenmore on a bicycle this spring. Or the young woman killed crossing Juanita Drive in Kenmore (killed by a Kirkland driver) this spring as well. Or John Przychodzen killed on Juanita Drive in Kirkland in the summer of 2011. Or Bradley Nakatani killed on NE 124th St in Kirkland in the winter of 2012/2013.

Kirkland has high frequency transit. The CKC is mass transit and needs to be considered as such for this policy as well. You were elected and appointed to represent all of the residents in the city and in Houghton respectively. Nothing I heard last night showed that anyone was representing anyone other than themselves.

Please reconsider your proposal and actually come up with a right-sized parking policy, not a "look at current car use which is induced demand from historical parking policy and set the minimums to be the maximum that those historical

policies created". That is not planning. That is the exact opposite of planning. The CBD parking issues should be treated separately and not be used as justification for making policy decisions that impact all of Kirkland for generations.

Thank you for listening to me,
Glen Buhlmann

South Rose Hill (with kids who attend school in Houghton and previous resident of both Houghton and downtown)



Jon Regala

From: Ivars Skuja <ivarsbev@gmail.com>
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 3:37 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: Parking

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Dear Jon,

We have lived in Kirkland for 38 years, and during this time, parking has increasingly gotten to be a real problem here.

We were appalled to learn that the city is considering a reduction in parking requirements for multi-family developments, and we want to go on record as being opposed to ANY reduction in spaces required.

We feel there should be no changes to current requirements, and if any changes are to be made, MORE spaces should be required not less

Ivars and Beverly Skuja
8861 Juanita Lane
Kirkland

Jon Regala

From: Jon Ericson <ericson.jon@comcast.net>
Sent: Tuesday, September 09, 2014 1:55 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: Multit-Unit Parking Capacity

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Mr. Regala,

After listening to your presentation at the Juanita Neighborhood Association meeting last night, September 8, 2014, I do not agree with the proposed parking capacity change by the City of Kirkland. Parking capacity should be increased for new development to reflect what is actually happening with resident lifestyle, employment centers and mass transit availability. The parking requirements need to be increased so that new development is sufficiently prepared to accommodate "more than estimated" minimum calculations. It is not right for street parking and neighborhoods to shoulder this burden, in favor of a developer maximizing living units. Kirkland is not inner city living, we are still car bound for enjoyment and commuters to work.

Jon Ericson
11008 100th Ave NE, Kirkland, WA

Jon Regala

From: Duekerk@aol.com
Sent: Sunday, September 07, 2014 1:39 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: Right size parking

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Right sizing parking is a commendable objective, But achieving it takes more than adjusting parking ratios. Although the City does not want to get involved with the management of private parking, right sizing parking will require incentivizing efficient management of parking.

The least efficient utilization results from assigning all spaces to apartments. The most efficient utilization is achieved by not assigning spaces to apartments. Residents have a hunting license. A compromise is to assign one space to each apartment and pool the remaining spaces.

The City could administer the pooling of parking by maintaining current parking ratios, but allowing a large reduction for total pooling of parking and a lesser reduction for partial pooling.

Another strategy to right size parking is to incentivize developers and property managers to unbundle the cost of housing and parking. Again, a parking reduction would be granted where developers or property managers agree to price housing and parking separately. This could be done for condo developments and for rental apartments.

As a member of the Parking Advisory Board we investigated this issue and proposed the change from spaces per unit to spaces per bedroom. We also discussed the incentivizing strategies but did not develop them fully.

Ken Dueker
501 Kirkland Ave #302
Kirkland WA 98033
425-889-4427
duekerk@aol.com

Jon Regala

From: Kari Page
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 9:00 AM
To: 'msailor@comcast.net'; Caryn Saban
Cc: Jon Regala
Subject: RE: Information about the proposed reduction in parking requirements for multi-family housing -important to read to understand

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi Caryn
Can you forward the email from Liz Hunt (below) to the Planning Commission?
See email thread below.
THANKS
Kari

Kari Page

Neighborhood Outreach Coordinator
City of Kirkland
City Manager's Office/Public Works Department
Office: 425-587-3011
Cell: 425-736-6477
Email: kpage@kirklandwa.gov

[Neighborhood E-Bulletins](#) | [Kirkland on Twitter](#) | [Capital Projects](#) | [Neighborhood Services](#)

From: msailor@comcast.net [mailto:msailor@comcast.net]
Sent: Friday, September 05, 2014 8:49 AM
To: Kari Page
Subject: Fwd: Information about the proposed reduction in parking requirements for multi-family housing -important to read to understand

Kari,

Do you have email address for planning committee that I can forward Liz's email?

Michelle

Sent from my iPhone please excuse the brevity.

Begin forwarded message:

From: Liz Hunt <liz@starwhite.net>
Date: September 4, 2014 at 3:57:01 PM PDT
To: Michelle Sailor <msailor@comcast.net>
Subject: RE: Information about the proposed reduction in parking requirements for multi-family housing -important to read to understand

Michelle,

Thank you for the information about the proposed reduction in parking requirements for multi-family housing within a ½ mile of downtown Kirkland. Would you please let me know where I should direct my comments, or please forward them for me?

I am concerned that the proposed reductions would significantly strain the already limited parking available in the downtown core and in the surrounding area. Kirkland has some good bus routes, but they are not growing to meet even the current need. Kirkland has some parking lots, but they are already heavily used. Residents of multi-family housing would increase the load on the already busy buses and parking lots. I'm not saying that we should stop multi-family residential development. Rather, we need to ensure that sufficient infrastructure accompanies such development.

On a separate but related note, I was impressed to see the long stream of traffic coming west on 908 at 9:15 am this morning (Thursday). The traffic was backed up from the stop light at 908 and 114th Ave, all the way down to the light at 908/Central Way and 6th St. The majority of the traffic was turning south onto 6th St. I decided to follow it, and a large percentage of it turned into the Google offices. It's great for Kirkland to have the Google offices in our city, providing jobs and tax revenue. But we need to be aware of the impact of new development, both business and residential.

Thank you,

- Liz Hunt
1704 8th St W
Kirkland, WA

From: Michelle Sailor [<mailto:msailor@comcast.net>]

Sent: Tuesday, September 2, 2014 11:13 AM

To: Michelle Sailor

Subject: Information about the proposed reduction in parking requirements for multi-family housing - important to read to understand

Hello all,

Kirkland is looking at reducing the parking requirements for multi-family housing. I have included a couple of documents to help you understand this issue. Thanks to Mark Nelson our KAN rep and KAN for reviewing this proposal further. KAN meets next Wednesday to discuss this proposal further.

- KAN's letter to the Planning Commission requesting that they hold the Public Hearing open to allow time for KAN to offer its comments. That request was granted by the Planning Commission, so the record remains open for written comments (but not for comments from the podium).
- The Planning Commission packet for the public hearing, which outlines the proposal. This is in two files, Part 1 and Part 2.
- An earlier document from King County with their parking pricing analysis

I have copied and pasted the attached letter from Norkirk Neighborhood (east side of Market) as I believe Market shares some of those same concerns. Please let me know your thoughts on this issue so we can document it. We will work to have our own survey to help poll you but your individual comments are extremely helpful for me to get an idea on how best to represent the neighborhood concerns and views. I highlighted what I thought were valid points for those who like to skim 😊

Lastly, I have asked to have a speaker from the city present on this proposal at our next Market Neighborhood meeting on Wednesday, September 24. Important to note that the city will deliberate on this on September 25 so ideally would like for you to comment before this meeting. We have had several Market residents ask to speak with someone about this proposal but they have not been successful so the best way to get your concern or comment noted would be to email City Planning Commission so it becomes part of public document or send to me and I will forward it to them for you.

Best,
Michelle

Michelle M Sailor
Market Neighborhood Chair
www.marketneighborhood.org
<http://www.facebook.com/westofmarket>

As members of the Norkirk Neighborhood we wish to express our concern about the amendments that the planning department is proposing for the following reasons:

A 15 % reduction within ½ mile of the downtown area for Multi –Family buildings will further aggravate the lack of parking currently available in the downtown core. The assumption that one and two bedroom residences will only have one stall and 1 ½ stall respectively, is a flawed assumption. Most homeowners/renters have two cars especially if both are wage earners and need to commute to work.

Secondly how does the planning department intend to hold the developers responsible for ensuring that the owners/renters only have correct numbers of cars for the parking spaces provided? The proposal to have developers pay for public transportation subsidies will not work. Time and time again the residents are left dealing with the implications and the frustrations of inadequate parking spaces. Owners/renters with additional cars will look for alternate locations to park their cars which mean parking on the streets, thus taking up parking spots for business customers and visitors to the area. I have witnessed owners/renters who take public transportation, parking on streets north and south of the downtown core and walking to the bus terminals.

Thirdly utilizing the Seattle standard ratio is an incorrect assumption. The public transportation in downtown Seattle is better especially with the sky train and frequency of buses. In addition most residents in the Seattle downtown are of a different demographic – young, do not own cars and have specifically moved into the area because of good public transportation and the ability to walk to work.

Kirkland has a different demographic base; families with young children and two cars at a minimum.

I do not believe that the city should further incentivize the developers at the expense of the residents.

Kirkland has not provided adequate park and ride facilities in the downtown core to accommodate the needs of residents who would like to take public transportation to work. My recommendation is to incorporate options to accommodate this need in the 2035 plan.

Thank you for your consideration.

Jon Regala

From: Dawn Nelson
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 4:13 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: FW: parking

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

From: Lorelee L [mailto:medieval.woman@gmail.com]
Sent: Thursday, September 04, 2014 3:38 PM
To: PlanningInfo
Subject: parking

I read that the city is proposing a reduction in the amount of parking required at multi-residence buildings--i.e., the city proposes having apartment buildings supply fewer parking spots. I think this is a bad idea. I often have the experience of visiting friends in apartments and not finding good visitor parking, or not finding street parking nearby. If there are two drivers living in an apartment, they need two parking spots.

I also find that parking in general is becoming a little more of a problem in my own neighborhood, South Rose Hill. Since new construction mandates the addition of sidewalks, all the parking in front of the old house is lost. Instead, people now park next to the sidewalk, which means the cars protrude out into the street. For instance, the new sidewalk on 126th between 73rd and 75th means that visitors must park next to the sidewalk, and this in turn effectively narrows traffic there from a 2 lane to a 1 lane spot. Cars must take turns driving in one direction or the other. I think that if Kirkland requires sidewalks, the sidewalks should be pushed back to allow for street parking which still lets the road be passable.

Please continue to provide for parking, both in apartments and on streets, as the Kirkland planning continues. Narrow streets and full lots make it harder to park and harder to drive.

Sincerely

Lorelee Leavitt
12425 NE 73rd Street, Kirkland
425-739-9746

Jon Regala

From: Pat Wilburn <patrick_wilburn@hotmail.com>
Sent: Friday, August 29, 2014 10:27 AM
To: David Godfrey; Mark Nelson
Cc: Kari Page; Michelle Sailor; Marilynne Beard; Jon Regala
Subject: RE: Kirkland Parking Study

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Hi David -

I wanted to add a couple of other inputs into the early thinking on potential parking changes to the downtown area.

I am including Jon Regala on this mail as well, so that this feedback is seen by the Multi-Family Parking committee as well.

1. It appears the City intends to move ahead with changes to the Multi-Family Parking Requirements to limit the number of spots required for such properties. Can you help us understand what protections will be put in place to ensure this does not create spill over into the neighborhoods surrounding downtown, including Market neighborhood? Do we need "Zone" parking for the surrounding neighborhoods? Do we need time-restrictions for those without zone placards? There are likely many other viable options, but the primary point is that we don't want to "hope" that the surrounding neighborhoods are not impacted. Rather, we want to be planful about the change, and have appropriate protections in place so that the neighborhoods don't become spillover parking lots.

2. As you may have seen, Juanita Village is receiving negative publicity due to parking shortages, causing challenges for employees and the general public. <http://www.kirklandreporter.com/news/273064951.html>. For the Central Business District (CBD), we would be concerned about parking constraints that led employees to park in the surrounding neighborhoods (which don't currently have any time restrictions), in order to be able to come to work and do their jobs.

Thank you,
Pat Wilburn

Mobile: 206-679-2626



Jon Regala

From: Laurie Hanson <laurie.hanson4@frontier.com>
Sent: Saturday, September 13, 2014 9:30 AM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: regarding potential parkin changes

I would like to register my disapproval of the parking changes proposed. I've lived in Kirkland for over 40 years and have watched as we build more and more condensed housing and less parking. It just gets more difficult for patrons to park downtown so they can support the local businesses. We have to make it easier for business owners as they are the lifeblood of Kirkland. Last night to I tried to park in the library parking lot and found exactly 2 spaces at 7:00pm. Force employees to park offsite and increase public parking

Jon Regala

From: Mary Ousley <maousley@frontier.com>
Sent: Thursday, September 11, 2014 4:37 PM
To: Jon Regala
Subject: Concerns regarding lowering parking requirements for multi-family residences

Follow Up Flag: Follow up
Flag Status: Flagged

Greetings, Jon,

I'm concerned about the proposal to lower parking requirements for multi-family residences in all neighborhoods including those near the Kirkland Transit Center. Although Metro is the ideal way to travel to Seattle or other job centers on the Eastside, it is far from convenient for other destinations or at certain times of day and at night. I don't think that one can assume that those living close to the transit center, even if they use the bus to go to work, would not have a car. Nor can one assume that their visitors would arrive via Metro.

Even now, it appears that current parking requirements do not provide enough parking: Several mornings a week, I walk from my condo near Doris Cooper Park to downtown Kirkland and observe that most on-street parking in front of multi-family units on Lake Washington Blvd. is occupied. When I've visited a friend at the Portsmouth, there is usually no on-street parking available.

From time to time at my condo complex, we've faced issues with residents having more cars than their allotment of spots. It wouldn't be out of the question for future developers to plan for two parking spots for one bedroom units.

As a long-time Kirkland resident, I know that the lack of parking especially in the downtown area has been a constant concern. Let's not exacerbate this problem by reducing the requirements for parking at proposed multi-family residences.

Regards,
Mary Ousley