

## Comments received for the DRAFT Citywide Transportation Connections Map

Includes comments provided through 8:00am December 10, 2019.

This list will be updated regularly as additional comments are received.

ID	Method Received	Date	Comment
T62	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	I live next to this connection. I do not support the opening of this private street to thruway vehicular traffic. The residents of the private street currently allow pedestrian and bicycle traffic to travel on this private road and intend to continue doing so. There are no obstacles preventing pedestrian/bicycle access. Please remove this street from the list of possible connections.
T62	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T62- privately owned road, has a letter from residents on the street that don't want the road opened. Currently has a barricade. Nice path for pedestrian currently, but don't want it open to a road. The city can have the road as long as its never opened.
T62	Mail	14-Jun-19	<a href="#">Petition regarding T62</a>
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	We are home owners that have lived on NE 142nd St on Finn Hill for 20+ years. We chose to raise our family here and be a part of the community we live in through schools and neighborhood events. Our community of neighbors that live on NE 142nd street have managed best with the barrier in place. The barrier aides in the safety of the many children that live on the street. It would be a huge safety concern if the street became a through street. In addition to the disruption it would have on the neighborhood, if it was made a through street, it would also be unsafe for drivers when they stop at the top of the street at 84th and 142nd ST. At that spot they would encounter a blind spot and the potential for accidents there is of major concern. There was a feasibility study done by King County a few years ago to see if this would make a good through street and after surveyors finished the study, it was decided that the safety concerns regarding NE 142nd were valid and the barrier remained. The present barrier has been modified so that cars that had tried to go through the opening on the sidewalk were prevented passage. Several times drivers in small cars and motorcycles raced through the opening and over the sidewalk in order to quickly get through. Thankfully, that was remedied with a cement cylinder! This street does not need to be a freeway for drivers in a hurry. Finally, we have had several occasions where an aid car or fire truck has been called to the neighborhood and the quickness that they were able to get here was not a problem. This is really not an issue when you consider that to save a few minutes isn't as vital compared to the major safety concerns that would happen if the barrier came down.Please consider reviewing the existing study that was done by King County as well as recognize the negative impact opening this street would have on the Finn Hill community that lives here.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I appreciate that you are reexamining the traffic flow patterns for the Kirkland area. Goodness knows that traffic everywhere is bad and getting worse. The presence of the barricade on 142nd St. is necessary, however, for safety. There are many children at play on and around the street. There are also several elderly people walking along the street. The removal of the barricade would increase traffic much more than what currently exists, as people who previously had no reason to drive through take advantage of the street to shave a block off of their commute.Ostensible reasons to remove the barricade do not pass muster:- Better traffic flow: there is currently no traffic delays around our neighborhood, within many blocks in any direction. - Better traffic flow: within a couple of blocks north and south there are through streets, so that getting from larger streets into the neighborhood or leaving, are both quite easy.Those streets, in fact, have been available for use for decades, creating familiarity. And one of them is in fact large enough to handle all the existing traffic without any perceptible stoppage. Several blocks further there is an even larger street.- Map confusion: while ten years ago when GPS receivers first became common there was the occasional wrong turn, nowadays the maps have been updated so that any smartphone is able to find the street and get into it correctly. I am currently looking at Google Maps and the street and barricade are represented correctly. In fact, a far greater confusion was caused by the incorporation of this area into Kirkland proper.I myself have received packages from the USPS, FedEx, and UPS without any difficulties. And taxis and other transportation like Uber have been able to arrive exactly when they've said they would.I personally experience absolutely no problems with this barricade in place. In fact, I enjoy the quiet of a neighborhood without through traffic, which I believe is also statistically safer in terms of burglaries and other crimes. It would be a shame to cause disruption to a neighborhood which is so friendly and where people feel safe to go and talk with their neighbors.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I recently purchased the home on the corner of NE 142nd St and 90th Ave NE, and I am very concerned about the removal of the barricade that is currently preventing thru traffic on NE 142nd St. One of the main selling points for this house was the lack of thru traffic and speed bumps on our road. As the proud father of a one year old daughter, I take comfort in the fact that the speeding traffic we constantly deal with on 90th Ave does not also pass by on NE 142nd. As I walk through the neighborhood every day, I have observed that 137th, 139th, and 141st/89th/140th all see an increased amount of traffic. I have also observed a large amount of through traffic regularly exceeding the speed limit, and frequently engaging in rapid acceleration and braking while passing over speedbumps. If the barrier were removed, our safe neighborhood road would be threatened by an influx of traffic from a large portion of the larger neighborhood because our road would become the most direct route to St Edward State Park, and the Inglewood commercial district. I am also concerned that we will lose what amounts to a small concrete park near the barrier. I have noticed the children on our neighborhood using this area to play basketball and street hockey on a regular basis; additionally, the barrier creates a safe place for our children to learn to ride their bicycles without the hazard of vehicles frequently traveling down the road.In conclusion, not only am I opposed to removing the existing barriers on Finn Hill, but in concern for the safety of our neighbors, I would promote adding more barriers to prevent through traffic between 84th Ave NE and 90th Ave NE between NE 134th St and NE 145th St. I believe this action would reduce the need for hazardous speed bumps, and create a clear path for through traffic on the fewest number of roads possible.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am writing to hope keep our barricade on NE 142ND ST to prevent the traffic from both sides of the neighborhood being too fast. We live on corner of NE 142ND ST/90TH AVE NE and heard from the neighbors that our barricade is one of those barricade that under studying to be removed. My husband and I are really concerning after the barricade removed, the traffic is going to be too fast at the intersection of 90th AVE NE/NE 142ND ST:Our street is located at the downhill of 90th AVE NE but no stop sign for it, so cars are a lot faster than they expect to be when they are coming from uphill alone 90th AVE NE. Removing the barricade won't slow down cars from uphill, but will also bring up speed of traffic on NE 142nd ST. And meanwhile there're lots of kids get used to playing in the neighborhood without worrying the traffic. Thank you for your prompt attention.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	We heard that you are planning to remove the barricade on our street on 142nd ST. We are strongly/outrageously disagree with the plan to remove the barricade.The barricade is the reason why we bought the house 14 years ago. We have five kids and on our street there are about 30 kids. By removing the barricade, traffic will increase greatly and our kids can't play/be outside safely anymore which will cause more safety issues and you are putting our kids in great danger/ risk.So, we are strongly against of the removal of the barricade and we are very disappointed in your choices/decisions for not considering the "SAFETY OF OUR KIDS IN OUR STREET".Please reconsider your plans.

T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I recently became aware that you are considering the removal of the barricades on the neighborhood streets on either side of our home and wanted to reach out to you. We live on 90th Ave right near where it changes to 88th and have two elementary age children. Our kids love to ride their bikes and the traffic on 90th Ave, where the speed limit is 25, is traveling MUCH faster than permitted. We have asked Kirkland police officers who we see in the neighborhood to monitor this more in an effort to get people to slow but have not seen much impact. At this time we take our kids over to NE 142nd street to ride their bikes to the barricade and around the nearby streets as they are quieter and provide a safe riding environment. I fear that the through traffic that be present if this barricade was removed would change this and 90th Ave would remain unsafe as well. There are many kids in this neighborhood and they are out riding bikes, playing with balls and walking around our neighborhood. This is especially true as Thoreau Elementary, my kids school, is a walking school and provides no buses due to the close proximity of the students homes. All this said, my ask is that if you plan to open these currently barricaded streets to traffic you implement an accompanying plan to keep the neighborhood safe for the children and residents of the neighborhood. I don't know if this means speed bumps, traffic circles or other traffic control mechanisms but it is vital that this done at the same time to prevent accidents and the related injuries. I also wanted to note that our yard has the stop sign for the intersection of NE 143rd street and 90th Ave and that stop sign is rarely abided by. Many of the cars roll through with or without looking. Even without the removal of the noted barricades, I would like you to consider the introduction of a traffic circle or something along those lines to make this intersection safer and to slow the through traffic on 90th. I would be willing to care for the landscape of the circle and would work to garner the support of the neighbors if necessary. I am open to other suggestions but something needs to be done to make 90th Ave safer especially if one or both of the suggested barricades are removed.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am writing in opposition of the proposal to remove the 142nd street barrier. I could see the need for traffic mitigation if Finn Hill was not already built up. The only people who come up here live up here so there is a finite number of people who will need to use the road. I travel on 90th Avenue during peak rush hour times every day (7:30-8:00am and 5-6:30pm) and there is never any bottleneck up around 142nd. Sometimes there is a car in front of us and sometimes there is a car behind us, that's about it. The only bottleneck is the unavoidable single lane of 132nd and even that doesn't take very long to get through. Removing the barricade on 142nd will not provide very much traffic mitigation because there is not a significant amount of traffic to mitigate. Additionally, the area on 142nd St and 84th Ave is a blind hill with a pond. The pond feeds into a water system that runs along 142nd and culminates in a watershed/catchment on 142nd St and 90th Ave. Repaving the road and trying to redirect cars through this road would put runoff into the water, which is undesirable. Also, the entrance point on 84th Avenue is a relatively steep grade; I have had a few close calls with drivers swinging in too wide and quickly because it is not easy to see a pedestrian due to the grade of the road. I do not think the shape of the land in this area makes it ideal for encouraging through traffic. In regards to emergency vehicle access, I feel that if this was an issue then barricades would not be allowed anywhere at all. I think a worthier use of the \$225,000 share of this \$900,000 proposal would be to install sidewalks along 90th Avenue between 132nd St and 136th St. Addressing the lack of a sidewalk and general narrowness of this section of 90th Avenue is certainly more relevant and beneficial to bus commuters, bicyclists, and parents than the barricade on 142nd. Another good project would be sidewalks along 84th Street since there are students and some amount of bus commuters who use this area. There is a curb separating the pedestrian area from the road but I think a sidewalk would be safer and better. Please do not remove the barricade on 142nd St. It guarantees a certain measure of calm in our neighborhood and more importantly there is a water system along this road and the city's money would be better spent on improvements in more high traffic areas of the neighborhood. Thank you very much.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I'm writing to ask you to reconsider removal of the barricade at NE 142nd Street. This is number 2 on the map shown at the latest planning commission meeting. Not so many years ago when our real estate agent showed us a house on Finn Hill that was just off of NE 142nd Street, we were pleasantly surprised by the neighborhood. A friendly cat was waiting for us on the sidewalk. A little girl skipped up to us, said, "Hi!" and told us her name. As we left, people out for walks on NE 142nd waved to us! The agent laughed when we asked whether all of this was staged for the house showing. Now after purchasing the home, we have found the neighborhood to be exactly as we thought. Guests even comment on how quiet the street is and how you normally do not find such a neighborhood in a large city. They notice how people of all ages are out walking with their pets or children. They also notice the bikers, joggers, and children playing. The fact that this is a street with sidewalks was mentioned in the Neighborhood Plan as a positive for an open through street. However, the sidewalks are exactly why this street receives more foot traffic than streets nearby. Car traffic is generally slower because the street is not wide enough to accommodate two cars passing in opposite directions; one car has to pull to the side. I'm opposed to removing the barricade because the next through street is not far away. Opening the barricade will only cause speeders to cut through to save a few seconds while we lose all of the above. Normally I am for progress, but is losing this barricade really progress? I would much rather have a barricade that can be opened by emergency vehicles only. Thank you for listening.
T61	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am against the removal of the barricade on NE 142 Street. I purchased my home in '06 and one of the things that I loved about it was that it was on a "Dead end street". Now having children, its even more important. I spend countless hours riding bikes up and down the street with my three year old son. I want my daughter who was born on 9/9/17 to have the same safe environment to ride as well. Speeding and lack of complete stops is a problem on our hill and on 90th ave NE. Currently I do not have to worry about these issues on our street but will have to worry if the barricade is removed. I see and appreciate the police presence but removing the barricades will only make it harder for them to enforce the speed limits and laws. I know that the multiple families on our street all feel strongly about the safety that we currently are granted, please take into consideration what the barricade removal could do to our children's safe play area.
T57	Petition	18-Nov-19	<a href="#">Petition regarding T57</a>

T57	Online Comment	6-Nov-19	<p>own property and reside on 101st PL NE. We bought this home to live in an enclave manifested by double dead end streets. As a resident in this neighborhood, I have concerns related to T57. There are many reasons that NE 139th St. is not a candidate for vehicle permeability or boutique thoroughfare.</p> <p>Feasibly, it makes no sense for the city of Kirkland to open NE 139th St to 100th Ave NE. NE 139th St. seems to have never been planned or excavated with expansion in mind. The road is narrow. Neighbors park along each side of this dead end street. When neighbors park their vehicles on either side of NE 139th St, there is barely room to navigate a vehicle through NE 139th St. to 101st PL NE. The chance of vehicle collision is great and a liability to any random vehicle and the physical risk for harm to persons exiting or entering their parked vehicle would be imminent and foreshadowed. NE 139th St was not planned for effective flow of simultaneous 2 way traffic. Also, please let's remember there is immediate access to 100th Ave NE through the existing NE 140th St.</p> <p>Residents navigate through the neighborhood, and often, they walk in the street. They walk in the streets with young children in strollers, walk with dogs on leashes and ride on bicycles specifically between NE 140th St. to the end of 101st PL NE up onto 139th St because there is no thru traffic. Thereby would be an even greater concern for human injury or fatality with an opening of NE 139th St to through traffic.</p> <p>There are many reasons that NE 139th St. is not a candidate for either vehicle permeability or boutique thoroughfare. I have highlighted a few here. Therefore, with any further consideration of T57, please reconsideration and choose no.</p>
T57	Online Comment	6-Nov-19	<p>I am concerned about the impacts to this neighborhood from traffic. When northbound traffic on 100th is backed up, drivers will use 139th as a shortcut. 139th and 101st Pl are both very narrow roads; much narrower than 140th and 101st Pl (north of 140th).</p> <p>I am also concerned about the impacts to the 'arterial' that is 100th. This main road, which is supposed to act as an arterial, already has far too many intersections and private drives. Adding an intersection at 139th will further reduce the effectiveness of 100th as an arterial.</p>
T57	Email	6-Nov-19	<a href="#">King County Department of Assessments map related to T57.</a>
T57	Public Hearing comment 1	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T57	Public Hearing comment 2	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T57	In-person Meeting	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Historical document related to T57 from the King County Hearing Examiner.</a>
T57	Online Comment	25-Oct-19	The T57 connection would have a serious and negative impact on: property tax values, child & pedestrian safety, street parked vehicles on street not designed for larger capacity traffic, noise and exhaust pollution. This proposed connector should be removed from the city planning map.
T57	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	As one of the homeowners on NE 139th street, I completely oppose this proposal. It will destroy our peaceful neighborhood and create chaos to us as well.
T57	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. The city has not submitted any good reason for opening NE 139th St.</li> <li>2. NE 139th St. is too narrow for its own occupants and residents to move about, let alone fire trucks and other emergency vehicles</li> <li>3. There is another access in the next block (NE 140th) with adequate width for emergency trucks turnaround. No need to have another one within such a short distance.</li> <li>4. If 139th is to be opened, the street would have to be widened and the residents would be losing land or sidewalks</li> <li>5. Quiet residential streets, especially of that size should not be opened to Commercial traffic and homeowners should not bear the financial and other burdens of commercial developments</li> <li>6. Any commercial redevelopment on 100th impacting 139th St., should be required to include a plan bearing the burden of traffic on the property to be redeveloped just as the administrative judgment entered in 2000 blocked such access and placed the burden on the day care to provide turn around for its traffic.</li> <li>7. Public policy requires weighing commercial gain against public safety and quality of life</li> <li>8. There is an earlier administrative judgement with no further right to appeal stopping the opening of the traffic onto NE 139th St.</li> <li>9. We will file a legal action again and object to any redevelopment project that involves opening of 139th St.</li> </ol>
T57	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	<p>Dear Council members:</p> <p>I would like to voice my opposition to T57. Extending the street in question to 100th would not be an improvement, but instead would be a detriment and very disruptive to the quiet nature of a neighborhood whose families use the streets for biking and playing. Currently, the stop signs and speed limits are not always adhered to in this neighborhood which is very scary and potentially unsafe for those who bike, walk, play here and pets. Increased traffic would mean more drivers ignoring the stop signs and speeding through the neighborhood. Presently, drivers use 140th as a shortcut through the neighborhood and an additional thoroughfare would mean extra unnecessary traffic and added congestion to a bedroom community's streets. We do not need more traffic in our neighborhood so please keep our neighborhood safe from an increase in traffic and vote no for this proposal.</p> <p>One suggestion would be to install a traffic signal at the intersection of 100th and 140th to help manage the traffic flow.</p>
T57	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	<p>I live at the intersection of 101PL and 139st and I am against the T57 proposal. It is completely unnecessary, as there is an existing connection to 100th Ave literally 200ft north. The 101st PL at this area is narrow with cars parked at the curb. Sending through traffic to this street will create lots of dangerous situations.</p> <p>In addition, the 139st has as slope that ends directly at my house. During bad weather, especially in snow or ice conditions, there are much higher chances that a driving through car wont be able to break and will slam into my property.</p>

T57	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	We would hate to see this connection. Neighborhoods need to have a sense of safety and privacy. This road is just making it easier for a few to speed through the neighborhood to bypass the main roads. This is neighborhood - not a main road. If you made our cul-de-sac a main road it would completely change our neighborhood and add very little benefit to anyone.
T57	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	We live at 101st pl NE and 139th. We bought this house on a dead end street to raise our children without high traffic flow. I am highly concerned about the amount of traffic this new street would bring to our neighborhood, the safety of our children, and decrease of our property values. This new proposed street is unnecessary due to the thru street at 140th.
T57	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	AS residents of 101st PL NE, south of NE 140th St we are vehemently opposed to the connection of NE 139th St to 100th Ave NE  General disturbance of lifestyle for residents of NE 139th St and 101st PL NE  Increased noise by construction and volume of traffic  Decreased street safety by increased volume of traffic  Decreased neighborhood security by increased volume of traffic and pedestrians  Physical limitations and risks of 101st PL NE (south of NE 140th St)  Street is at least 10 feet narrower than 101st PL NE, north of NE 140th St  If residents of 101st PL NE park vehicles on street between NE 139th St and NE 140th St, this further constricts potential traffic to one lane Residents are currently at risk navigating 101st PL NE when deliveries from box truck vehicles are made  (continued below)
T57	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	(continued from above) Collisions with parked vehicles along 101st PL NE from residents leaving garages along 101st PL NE due to narrowness of 101st PL NE have been documented  Physical limitations and risks of intersection of NE 139th St and 101st PL NE  The grade of NE 139th St will put residents of NE 139th St and 101st PL NE in harm's way by increasing traffic flowing onto 101st PL NE (the general speed of vehicles descending eastward will be misjudged leaving the arterial nature of 100th Ave NE)  In particular, residents of 13904 101st PL NE and 13912 101st PL NE would possess higher risk as they are at the terminal bottom of the descent from NE 139th St with the majority of traffic turning northward from NE 139th St  Weather events such as rain, snow, sleet or ice would further imperil this new intersection as speed by driver's will inevitably be misjudged in conjunction with the narrowness of 101st PL NE  Although marked by a 3-way stop at NE 140th St and 101st PL NE, driver's readily ignore the posted signs and speed through the intersection, uninhibited - this would undoubtedly be replicated at the intersection of NE 139th St and 101 PL NE, jeopardizing drivers and residents alike
T57	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	T57 is an unnecessary project that would bring harm to residents of NE 139th and 101st PL NE in the form of increased traffic and security concerns  T57 would be redundant as NE 140th St already serves the purpose of entry/exit to the neighborhood which lies less than 100 yards away, north on 100th Ave NE  Furthermore, the T57 extension, triggered by the development of the properties on 100th Ave NE would bring undue economic pressure to the property owners to fulfill requirements for a private project street that would not serve their needs nor is wanted by the neighborhood - this in turn will decrease the value of the property and the surrounding neighbor properties of NE 139th St and 101st PL NE  We chose to live on 101st PL NE because of the dead end street for the safety of our family  Please remove T57 from the connections plan

T57	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	<p>Connecting the existing 1/2 block section of NE 139th Street to 100th Avenue NE would cause a number of problems:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Cars entering a new section of NE 139th Street would have nowhere to go except a left turn that immediately confronts a stop sign.</li> <li>2. The existing short section of NE 139th Street that intersects with 101st Place NE has been a longstanding (for the 35 years we have lived here) safe location for neighborhood children from up to 1/2 mile away to learn to ride scooters and bikes and to sled on during snowy weather. There is no comparable protected area nearby for kids to practice these skills that help them reduce their carbon footprints.</li> <li>3. There is a neighborhood gathering spot in front of 13829 101 Place NE that includes a Little free Library, toys for little kids to play with, an adult and a child's bench, and two small community garden spots with snack veggies and strawberries. Neighbors of all ages wander through this area at all times of day - from early morning strolls to late evening walks. Any added traffic on NE 139th Street would dramatically increase the risk of pedestrian/bike/car collisions.</li> </ol> <p>If the two properties located just North and South of along 100th Avenue NE decide to develop - condos, apartments, more neighborhood home - an entrance from 100th Avenue NE would be preferable. Otherwise, place a light at NE 140th Street and 100th Avenue NE, add a stoplight, and let traffic trickle through from NE 140th to access the new residences.</p>
T57	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	<p>I vehemently oppose the extension of NE 139th St to 100th Ave NE as this would create an unnecessary connection already served by NE 140th St</p> <p>The increase of traffic will put the residents in physical harm's way as the current streets are not wide enough to carry anymore vehicles than the current residents residing in the immediate neighborhood of NE 139th and 101st PL NE.</p> <p>If completed, an increase to traffic and pedestrian access would increase crime related incidents including car prowling, burglary and mail/porch theft as suspects would have easier entry and exit to the neighborhood</p> <p>T57 should be removed from the Kirkland City connections plan both current and future renderings</p> <p>Thank you</p>
T57	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	<p>I'm a little perplexed about the reasoning to complete the connection of 139th to 100th when there is one approx 500 feet away at 140th. The cut through traffic currently on 140th is not heavy, but the speeding and theft is greater going north from 140th on a 101st. In our neighborhood south of 140th on 101st we have a dead-end and criminal activity is very low if at all as well as speeding. Opening this road will not speed emergency vehicles when another access is literally 2 seconds away. The two properties that would need development for this road to connect are zoned low density residential, but I am sure that will change to high density or multi-use. With multi use and this road connected that will be a mess for us living here. I could see permitting for housing and then having them drive through our current neighborhood to access but not connecting 139th to 100th. This would keep it a quiet, safe neighborhood and just a little greater traffic. When I read the reasons given for other roads that are similar to ours that will be connected it seems the go to statement is for emergency vehicles but in this case this would not hold water.</p>
T57	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	<p>As a resident of the neighborhood, I am NOT in favor of T57 to connect dead end NE 139th St. to 100th Ave NE. We have been Kirkland residents since 2001. We bought our house on 101st Pl. NE only a mile away from our apt. complex in 2005. We love the Juanita area. We have seen the development of Juanita Village. And now....the city of Kirkland wants to potentially redevelop land in my quiet, double dead end street in the name of progress. I say NO. We specifically bought our house on 101st Pl. NE for a number of reasons: We wanted to live on a cul-de-sac and/or dead end street. We wanted minimal traffic and a quiet, mature neighborhood. We wanted to know our neighbors on our intimate block. I grew up on a cul-de-sac and as an adult homeowner, I wanted the same positive experience. There are neighbors here with small children raising their families. There are original owners here who have raised their families and now have small grandchildren who visit often. Both streets, NE 139th and 101st Pl NE are extremely narrow. If cars are parked on each side of the street, the streets go down to single, narrow lanes. Impassable without be cautious of speed. It is not wise to add more traffic in our neighborhood with original streets intended for residential traffic only. If the properties are redeveloped on 100th Ave NE, We do NOT want added transient traffic to our neighborhood. There is no reason to disrupt our established, quiet neighborhood in the name of "progress". Adding commercial traffic thru our residential area only invites danger and a less safe neighborhood. Our streets are not capable of supporting high traffic volumes. In the next block north, NE 140th St. is a main thoroughfare and is extremely wide and can accommodate increased traffic flow.</p>
T57	Online Comment	19-Oct-19	<p>As a resident of this neighborhood, I am against the T57 proposal. It is an unnecessary connection for this neighborhood. It should be removed from the current and future Kirkland city connections map. Nothing good can become of this proposed connection other than inconvenience to residents like myself.</p>
T57	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	<p>To many children in the area to have additional traffic on 139th to 101st PL</p> <p>As it stands now not many if any vehicles stop at the corner of 101st PL &amp; 140th with a slow down to 20 mph being a "full stop" at this corner. I know, I have lived @ 14005 101 PL NE (corner of 101st &amp; 140th) since 1978. With the added traffic coming from 139th to the corner of 140th &amp; 101 PL accidents will occur. People just don't stop at this corner. When we were serviced by the county I had called numerous times with the response "we cannot do anything unless there is an incident". When we were annexed we were told that we would have more and better police presence, NOT. We do not need more congestion at this intersection. It is also a main path for children getting off the school bus on 100th and for children coming from Helen Keller school on 102nd PL NE. Please do not expand 139th.</p>
T57	Online Comment	22-Oct-19	<p>I don't think this connection is a good idea. It will bring more traffic into a quiet residential neighborhood, and I am not sure who would benefit. It would allow cars going northbound on 100th to turn right one block sooner, but I am not sure why that would be helpful</p> <p>If we made a pedestrian connection where T57 is now being proposed, that would be beneficial. Neighbors occasionally walk down to the store and having a pedestrian connection would make that easier and quicker.</p>

T56	Online Comment	23-Jun-19	T56 is a good connection for multi-modal connection, with a possible connection for fire access - meaning not full time for vehicles. There is a significant grade difference between the two street ends - and a lack of right of way. An existing pathway is well used by the neighbors and improving the pathway with easement and better pathway conditions would be a good project. Fire and police access to NE 138th Place from 97th Ave NE is not a problem. This is not the project to pursue, except for pedestrian and bicycle connection and possibly a fire vehicle access with bollards.
T56	Online Comment	12-Oct-19	There is a significant elevation change between the north and south ends of 97th Ave NE. There is an existing footpath that is adequate for pedestrian traffic. However, it is hard (if not impossible) to visualize how to design a street connection due to the elevation change. It would probably also be complicated by a nearby slide area. Even if such a connection could be designed, it would subject the neighbors to increased vehicle traffic and noise.
T56	Online Comment	16-Oct-19	It's hard to tell from the Connections Map, but this connection appears to be bordered by multiple property addresses/parcels. Development at which address/addresses/parcel/parcels would require construction of this connection? Could you add that information to the Description section that can be seen when clicking on the connection in the map.
T52, T47.1	Online Comment	24-Sep-19	I am NOT in favor of this street connection. It is in conjunction with the T47.1 proposed connection to Holmes Point Drive which is ridiculous considering that dirt pathway runs down the crest of a wooded ravine and would be so cost prohibitive to the required construction its laughable. Our neighborhood has always felt safe in its natural dead end formation. Opening up this roadway would introduce more traffic creating a hazard for the children that live & play here. NO to these connections T47.1 & T51
T52, T47.1	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Do we have to buy back land to make this connection?
T52, T51, T50	Online Comment	13-Jun-19	I am writing to ask that T-50, T-51, and T-52 not be installed. They would split Big Finn Hill park in two and make it far less nice.
T52	Email	16-Nov-19	I was dismayed to read that "city staff continue to recommend transportation connection" T-52, (i.e., completion of NE 132nd Street between Juanita Drive NE and 76th Ave NE as an emergency-access only connection, which will help achieve the Fire Departments' 4-minute drive time standard into the neighborhoods off NE 132nd Street west of Juanita Drive.) My husband and I attended the most recent forum dedicated to reviewing Kirkland's transportation corridor options – and – at that time neighborhood residents not only vocally expressed their strong opposition to this proposed connection, they followed up with a petition. Long-time residents noted that there was no empirical evidence that this corridor was necessary to ensure that the fire department could reach homes within the 4-minute drive time. In fact, the fire chief was present and confirmed that this access would not result in a significant decrease in fire department access time. What neighborhood residents DID request was the construction of a pedestrian/bicycle corridor that would allow for safer access to the neighborhood for those on foot or commuting on non-motorized vehicles. (This is especially important during this time of seemingly unchecked development in the Big Finn Hill area.) Also noted at the time of these discussions was that a bridge alone would not provide sufficient access to our neighborhood. New roads and upgrades to existing roads would also need to be built. If the Council is REALLY concerned about the safety of Big Finn Hill residents, consider spending money on a roundabout as 138th Place and Juanita Drive. THAT would be an improvement. You might also consider funding jitneys to get residents off "the hill" and into Kirkland safely and in less time than is currently possible, given the explosion of development up here. In sum, it is difficult to comprehend that T-52 is being considered, despite strong opposition to it by the very people it would most impact, its high price tag, and its limited utility. I urge you to reject T-52 as your constituents requested.
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	How about a pedestrian pathway rather than paved street. Great connection for school kids
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Not a roadway. NO No No
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Bike and pedestrian pathway okay.
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Maybe use low lights for the pedestrian pathway because it is dark.
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Connects neighborhoods to schools. Need crosswalk on Juanita Drive to get children across.
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Environmentally sensitive.
T52	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Need pedestrian bridge.
T52	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I live off of 76th Ave NE and am opposed to the potential connector road from 76th Ave to Juanita Drive by extending 132nd over Denny Creek. I think this would be a waste of money to serve a small neighborhood. I also like the atmosphere of our quiet gravel streets in our wooded neighborhood. No additional traffic is preferred.
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Pedestrian access that's lacking, with missing connections of sidewalks. Advocating for the children who need to walk, supporting T52- the park is unavailable, and people have to drive around to get to Juanita Supporting bicycles, pedestrian access,
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Emergency and pedestrian bridge is good
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Juanita Drive improvements would be a better investment
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Don't want a sky bridge with traffic
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	What about the prior proposal for a fire station in Finn Hill, would that eliminate the need for this?
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Precedent for building a connection through a County Park?
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need data on Highlands usage over I405
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	How often would it be needed? And how much would it cost?
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Make 138th more reliable
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Pedestrian crossing over Juanita Drive would be good too
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Juanita Drive Corridor study suggests a crosswalk across Juanita Drive at NE 132nd Street

T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Move up funding from CIP \$900K for SR2SAP - just build a ped/bike trail here - no emergency access
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	I'm opposed to the bridge. Too expensive.
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Left hand turn is difficult in AM. Need sensor activated light at 138th and Juanita Drive
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	We need real life data for this connection to know if it is worth it.
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Science of 4 minutes - is there anything residents can do?
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need the pedestrian and bicycle connection for school children
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Where are the areas with above 4 minute response times?
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Juanita Drive improvements will help traffic to keep 4 minute response time
T52	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Reduce congestion on 98th Avenue NE and this will help response time
T52	Email	14-May-19	I am unable to make the FHNA meeting tomorrow night but would like to give my opinion on the "2019 Proposed Connections V.1" I am vehemently against building an access road across Denny Creek from Juanita Drive to 76th Ave. I live at the southern end of 76th Ave in that neighborhood. It would be disruptive to the neighborhood, be disruptive to the fragile Denny Creek, and be a waste of taxpayer money (a large bridge would need to be built across the steep sided deep ravine). The access from 138th Street/72nd Ave is enough for our neighborhood.
T52	Email	12-Jun-19	I am writing to oppose the construction of T-52. It's an expensive project that will use city funds that could be better spent on other projects. In addition, it cuts Big Finn Hill park in two, which greatly decreases the beauty and value of the park. Cyclists and hikers come from all over the area to enjoy this park and will be sorely disappointed if a good chunk of the park is no longer accessible without braving traffic.
T52	Email	18-Jun-19	I first learned about the Kirkland Connections scheme last week, when a neighbor came to my door with a petition to quash the planned bridge at T52 and the adjacent road developments at T50 and T51 on Finn Hill. I signed the petition but due to previous planned travel could not attend the recent public input meeting on Saturday June 15th. My family paid a premium for, and moved into our home because it is on a quiet dead-end road with no through traffic. This planned development is going to ruin our neighborhood with commuters racing up and down our street every morning and evening, and wipe at least \$100K off the value of my property. The fire station is only a mere 2 miles from our neighborhood using existing roads – so there is no rational safety need for the T50-52 bridge and road developments. The only party these developments will benefit is the construction companies.
T52	Text	19-Aug-19	<p>Hello Kirkland connections! I support ALL 2019 proposed pedestrian connections because all paths for walking people lessens car traffic! Ingrid Salmon, 9319 NE 135th Lane, Kirkland 98034</p> <p>I support T52; this proposed road allows ALL folks (walking, biking, even maybe driving) to access the south end of this Big Finn Hill public park. I know folks there think NIMBY, but they nearly ALL drive out of that Neighborhood to west &amp; clog roads w their cars! Let the children walk to FHMS! Right now they are bussed or driven out of there! Ingrid Salmon</p> <p>Also, support T42, similar rationale! Let me know if received, please. Thanks!</p>
T52	Suggest-a-Project submission	17-Aug-19	Road with sidewalks and parking. On NE 132nd St. From 72nd Ave NE to Juanita Drive. BUT once the road reaches Denny creek, only a Fire access gate across Denny Creek. Then a full light and flashing crosswalks at 132nd and Juanita Drive
T52	Online Comment	9-Oct-19	T52 if done, needs to go all the way through to T47.1. That is all one road. Don't do a half was job.
T52	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	This is a watershed/stream area very sensitive to development of any kind. Leave it as it is.
T52	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	The T52 connection should definitely be a priority for a pedestrian connection along with an enhanced safe crossing treatment of Juanita Drive at 132nd. I would estimate the cost of an emergency connection is too expensive and that should not hold up the development of a pedestrian connection in the interim. This provides access to the church, Finn Hill Middle School, and elementary schools on 84th for residence west of Juanita Drive.
T51	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	As a Kirkland resident who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St. My family highly values the intimate connection that this neighborhood has with Finn Hill Park. The towering tree canopy, and the gravel road where neighbors regularly bicycle, walk their dogs, jog, and socialize with one another is a key reason we decided to move to Kirkland. Today 76th Ave. NE and NE 132nd St. are well functioning gravel roads (not a missing connection), which easily serve our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on their location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounded by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Pavement and sidewalks are an unnecessary and unwelcome addition to this neighborhood that would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.
T51	Online Comment	9-Oct-19	As someone who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St. Today it is a well functioning gravel road (not a missing connection), which easily serves our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on its location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounding by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Because of its secluded nature at the back of the neighborhood, it has very little traffic and people safely and comfortably walk dogs, ride bikes, and jog on it every day, and sidewalks are unnecessary. The gravel surface and towering tree canopy fits with the spirit of the trail system in Big Finn Hill Park that it connects to. Paving it would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.
T51	Online Comment	11-Oct-19	<p>I live on 76th Ave NE and do not feel it should be a paved road. It is a high functioning gravel road that needs to be left alone. It's not part of a grid street system. Paving would adversely affect the local trees and foliage. Further, it would cause a significant drainage issue. No one has asked for it to be paved, so please don't consider doing so.</p> <p>Again, Paving would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p>

T51	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	As someone who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St. Today it is a well functioning gravel road (not a missing connection), which easily serves our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on its location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounding by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Because of its secluded nature at the back of the neighborhood, it has very little traffic and people safely and comfortably walk dogs, ride bikes, and jog on it every day, and sidewalks are unnecessary. The gravel surface and towering tree canopy fits with the spirit of the trail system in Big Finn Hill Park that it connects to. Paving it would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.
T51	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	Do not pave this road! This is a quiet neighborhood on a gravel road up against the park. Garbage trucks, school buses, fed ex, Mail, all use the road just fine without it being paved. This is a dead end up against the park. It should not be paved.
T52, T51, T50	Email	17-Nov-19	<a href="#">Email regarding T52, T51, T50</a>
T50, 51, & 52	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T52	Email	19-Nov-19	<p>I've been closely following the progress of the proposal to connect NE 132nd St. with 76th Ave. NE for the past several years. I've spoken before the Kirkland Planning Commission, and I've signed the petition. During my tenure with the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance (FHNA), I pro-actively contacted my neighbors who would be most directly affected by the transformation. After all that, one particular point continues to baffle me: how is this project cost-justified?</p> <p>Lowering response time for emergency vehicles is a good idea, I don't argue that. I'm curious, however, how many millions of taxpayer dollars should be allocated to an improvement project that lowers response time by an average of only ninety seconds, potentially benefiting a mere 1.5% (approx.) of the Kirkland population? Permanently and negatively altering the character of a serene neighborhood, along with the pristine woodland adjacent, doesn't appear to be an adequate trade-off for that.</p> <p>Moreover, I'm concerned that the cost estimate has been calculated in a rather perfunctory manner. Does anyone on City Council doubt that the final price tag will likely be significantly, if not startlingly, higher?</p> <p>I'll close by repeating that firefighters and EMTs undoubtedly want what's best for the local citizenry, and they're to be applauded for their dedication and concern. But there's no legal requirement for this invasive construction to occur. And I'm fairly confident that the residents of our enclave feel fairly comfortable with emergency response time as it currently stands. If Council remains in doubt about this, please conduct a comprehensive poll before moving ahead any further.</p>
T52	Email	16-Nov-19	<p>I'm writing you tonight to urge you to designate the proposed T-52 bridge in the Citywide Connections project as "considered and rejected." I very much appreciate the thorough and inclusive outreach work the city manager's office has done on this matter. However, I don't feel that their recommendation (to keep T-52 in the plan but unfunded in the 20 year CFP) goes far enough in bringing closure to the neighborhood on this issue very near and dear to our hearts.</p> <p>We strongly feel that this potential connection should be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Poor cost / benefit <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>The cost is estimated by the city manager's office to be \$18.9 - \$20.4 million.</li> <li>The response time benefits would only affect a small neighborhood which doesn't want it.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Strong neighborhood opposition (we submitted a petition with 85 signatures on 6/15/2019 – see attached) <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Note how many of the residents who would be served by this bridge signed the petition (larger image in the attached petition):</li> <li>The neighbors aren't against all development – the petition supports the idea of a small, environmentally responsible, foot bridge over the creek if accompanied by a safe crosswalk across Juanita Drive so that kids in the neighborhood could walk to Finn Hill Middle School and Carl Sandburg Elementary.</li> <li>If you haven't had a chance already, please take a few minutes to read the attached petition – several neighbors spent many hours talking to the neighborhood, gathering opinions, formulating them into a written petition, then gathering signatures on nights and weekends. I want to be sure their efforts and the voices of those 85 people who signed the petition are heard.</li> </ol> </li> <li>Environmental impact – this bridge: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Would bisect Big Finn Hill park</li> <li>Spans city-mapped landslide/steep slope hazards</li> <li>Would require removing many "landmark" sized trees</li> <li>May have negative impacts on Denny Creek, a salmon bearing stream that the neighborhood association has put a lot of effort into preserving for fish habitat (see <a href="http://finnhillalliance.org/denny-creek-preservation/">http://finnhillalliance.org/denny-creek-preservation/</a> and <a href="https://kingcountywtd.com/2018/03/28/go-salmon-waterworks-grant-supports-finn-hill-neighborhoods-work-to-protect-denny-creek/">https://kingcountywtd.com/2018/03/28/go-salmon-waterworks-grant-supports-finn-hill-neighborhoods-work-to-protect-denny-creek/</a>)</li> <li>Would surely require an environmental review which would just add to the already high costs of the project</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Thank you for considering our community's concerns as you make your decision,</p>

T52	Email	18-Nov-19	<p>I'm writing you today to urge you to designate the proposed T-52 bridge in the Citywide Connections project as "considered and rejected."</p> <p>Like Kevin Brown, I appreciate the thorough and inclusive outreach work the city manager's office has done on this matter. However, I don't feel that their recommendation (to keep T-52 in the plan but unfunded in the 20 year CFP) goes far enough in bringing closure to the neighborhood on this issue very near and dear to our hearts.</p> <p>I strongly feel that this potential connection should be rejected for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Poor cost / benefit</li> <li>2. Strong neighborhood opposition as noted in the petition submitted with 85 signatures on 6/15/201 (Please note how many of the residents who would be served by this bridge signed the petition.)</li> <li>3. Large Environmental impact – this bridge: <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Would bisect Big Finn Hill park</li> <li>b. Spans city-mapped landslide/steep slope hazards</li> <li>c. Would require removing many "landmark" sized trees</li> <li>d. May have negative impacts on Denny Creek, a salmon bearing stream that the neighborhood association has put a lot of effort into preserving for fish habitat.</li> <li>e. Would surely require an environmental review which would add to the already high costs of the project</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Please note, as stated in the petition, that the community does support the idea of a small, environmentally responsible foot bridge over Denny Creek if accompanied by a safe crosswalk over Juanita Drive for families to walk to Finn Hill Middle School and Carl Sandburg Elementary.</p> <p>Thank you for considering our community's concerns as you make your decision,</p>
T50, 51, & 52	Emailed Petition with 85 signatures	15-Jun-19	<p>[Petition] We oppose construction of T-52, an expensive bridge that would separate two portions of Big Finn Hill park.</p> <p>We oppose the proposed "improvements" to NE 132nd St and 76th Ave NE (T-50 and T-51 ). These roads are already complete---no new connections are needed.☒</p> <p>We support improving children's access to Carl Sandburg Elementary and Finn Hill Middle School by building a pedestrian and bike trail along the route of T-52 for children to walk/ride to school.</p>
T50, 51, & 52	Email Attachments	15-Jun-19	<p><a href="#">Email attachments referenced in above 15-Jun-2019, 16-Nov-2019, and 18-Nov-2019 emails regarding T50-51-52.</a></p>
T50	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>As a Kirkland resident who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St . My family highly values the intimate connection that this neighborhood has with Finn Hill Park. The towering tree canopy, and the gravel road where neighbors regularly bicycle, walk their dogs, jog, and socialize with one another is a key reason we decided to move to Kirkland. Today 76th Ave. NE and NE 132nd St. are well functioning gravel roads (not a missing connection), which easily serve our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on their location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounded by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Pavement and sidewalks are an unnecessary and unwelcome addition to this neighborhood that would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p>
T50	Online Comment	9-Oct-19	<p>As someone who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St . Today it is a well functioning gravel road (not a missing connection), which easily serves our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on its location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounding by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Because of its secluded nature at the back of the neighborhood, it has very little traffic and people safely and comfortably walk dogs, ride bikes, and jog on it every day, and sidewalks are unnecessary. The gravel surface and towering tree canopy fits with the spirit of the trail system in Big Finn Hill Park that it connects to. Paving it would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p>
T50	Online Comment	11-Oct-19	<p>I live on 76th Ave NE and 132nd and do not feel either road should be paved. It is a high functioning gravel road that needs to be left alone. It's not part of a grid street system. Paving would adversely affect the local trees and foliage. Further, it would cause a significant drainage issue. No one has asked for it to be paved, so please don't consider doing so.</p> <p>Again, Paving would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p>
T50	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>The only reason traffic speed on this street is controlled is because some sections are narrower. If this street is opened up, pedestrians will not be safer. Kids will not be safer walking to school. I walk these streets every day and the only sections I feel totally safe on are the narrow parts. In the sections where newer construction has dictated wider streets with sidewalks, cars speed over the speed limits.</p> <p>Where are our police?</p>
T50	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>As someone who lives on 76th Ave NE (T51 on the map), I would like to object to the proposal to pave it and NE 132nd St . Today it is a well functioning gravel road (not a missing connection), which easily serves our huge garbage/recycle/yard waste trucks, as well as school buses, every week. Based on its location at the back of a dead end neighborhood surrounding by Big Finn Hill Park, it is not part of grid-like area, and paving it would not provide additional access. Because of its secluded nature at the back of the neighborhood, it has very little traffic and people safely and comfortably walk dogs, ride bikes, and jog on it every day, and sidewalks are unnecessary. The gravel surface and towering tree canopy fits with the spirit of the trail system in Big Finn Hill Park that it connects to. Paving it would destroy many landmark / tier 1, and tier 2 trees unnecessarily. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p>

T50	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	Do not pave this road (NE 132), nor 76th Ave NE. This is a quiet area with no connector against big Finn hill park. It is a gravel road that vehicles, trucks, Mail, fed ex, garbage service, etc already navigate efficiently. Paving would destroy the character of the neighborhood and destroy several of the canopy trees. The quiet nature of the area allows for jogging, bicycle riding, dog walking and fits in nicely with the trail system in the park. Sidewalks and paving are not needed and not wanted by the residents along the road, of which I am one. Please remove 76th Ave NE and NE 132nd St from the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.
T50 (T05.1)	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	I am strongly opposed to paving 76th Ave NE. It would destroy landmark trees and harm the character of the area that has an intimate connection to Finn Hill Park. It is not a grid-like area that requires paving and already allows access by buses and service trucks as is. (Staff note: this comment was provided as relating to T05.1, located in Everest. Staff's assumption is that this was intended to relate to T50 in Finn Hill.)
T49	Online Comment	24-Sep-19	This connection does not seem to be worth the cost or the disruption it would cause our neighborhood. We have a small number of houses on these two roads and it is hard to imagine that this connection would be widely used outside of emergency vehicles. We purchased this home specifically for its quiet, rural feel and this type of connection could increase the number of homes in our area. This neighborhood is experiencing a dramatic increase in new home building. I do not believe that the town has adequately planned for the amount of traffic our small roads will be experiencing shortly, or the traffic that will dump out onto the main roads.
T49	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	My home is located at 7127 NE 136th Street. If you refer to your development plan, you will see that the proposed #6 connection would bi-sect my property in half. My exceptions to this proposal are: 1. The proposed development plan has not been vetted for accuracy. The original plat development plans for both subdivisions on either side of 136th Street, as well as the original plat map for my property, do not include an easement such as the plan describes through the middle of my property. Nor was any easement identified in the title investigation when I purchased the property in 2010. The only easement described on these maps is a sewer easement running kitty-corner from the north west corner to a point 1/3 of the way on the south edge of the property – this easement parallels, in part, the edge of a 70 foot ravine at the western border my lot. Would the City and Planning Commission really propose a connecting road on the edge of a ravine? Before coming to the Commission with such a comprehensive proposal it should be incumbent on the planners to verify their information including confirming their recommendations with those most impacted. I would welcome the opportunity to entertain the planners recommending this proposal to my house to see first-hand the impact of such a proposed road. 2. The proposed connector is frivolous and serving no viable purpose. 136th Street is a private road – a gravel road - serving 3 houses. It is incomprehensible that a connecting street would be a development priority of the Planning Commission. If at some point all available land on 136th street is subdivided, this street would serve 6 houses - at most. Constructing a road between 136th and 137th provides no discernible benefit to the citizens or City. I can only guess that development plans for 137th street call for fire truck or service vehicle turnarounds: if so, the building code requires that vehicle access be provided from that property and landowner, and not from my unrelated property on 136th street. 3. The proposed connector is not consistent with City and Planning Commission plans for permeable surface development, storm drainage and tree retention. The City's commitment to permeable surface development and storm drainage control is commendable. The proposed connector would replace permeable surface with asphalt – and for what purpose? As a property owner, I would hope city planners would encourage plans for permeable surface development and not, as Carol King wrote you pave paradise and put up a ...#6 Connector? 4. The Planning Department and Commission This plan calls to question the purpose of the City's planning efforts. As a property owner I hope to meet with the planning department to learn how I might develop my property in the future in ways that are innovative for water retention, attractive, and maintain the quality of this beautiful hedge-lined private road. The idea of one more, short, stretch of unnecessary 22 foot road with gutters and sidewalks is inconsistent with any of these ideas. 5. Expensivelf the road were to be installed as described in the plan, the loss of ~ 30 ft of my property to the City for an unnecessary connecting road would render the Western half of my property undevelopable, due to the proximity to the ravine. This would be a loss that I would certainly fight, and that would prove an expensive court battle. In light of these objections I most adamantly request that you remove the #6 Connection from the Kirkland Development Plan for Finn Hill.
T47.1, T52	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Access - why do all the people get to keep people out? Open the access to pedestrians and cars. Early in the process.
T47.1	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Too steep of terrain. Is this feasible?
T47.1	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Reach out to neighbors
T47.1	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Developer was denied coming up from bottom due to environmental issues
T47.1	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Better pedestrian connection
T47.1	Online Comment	4-Nov-19	This is a very steep trail, but a locally beloved pedestrian connection. Please do not build a road here. It does not help with fire access, and would be very disruptive for the upper neighborhood.
T47.1	Public Hearing comment 1	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T47.1	Public Hearing comment 2	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T47.1	Email/Suggest a Project	6-Aug-19	Develop a walking trail to connect 130th PI to 132nd street. This section is wooded and contains public right of way that could be used for a trail. The project could easily be completed with volunteer labor with minimal material cost. The impact would be to substantially increase the walking path options for the Finn Hill and Holmes Point area. Indeed, the path would connect two significant areas that are currently disconnected from any possible walking path.
T47.1	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	Concerning the connection between 70th Ln NE and NE 130th pl, this would create many problems and have significant environmental impact, while providing a worse travel time to the proposed street. The proposed firefighter response of 4 minutes or under is achieved, but this time is increased by 50% when accessing through the proposed road. This is a landslide hazard/ravine area that would require significant funds to build on, IF it is even possible. Removing trees in these areas is DANGEROUS to the people and homeowners of Finn Hill. Even if the area above was paved, the road CANNOT support through-traffic and cannot be expanded to two lanes as it parallels a creek. The road itself is one lane and was not paved by the city. Every day this 'road' which is more of a path that happens to be wide enough for a car is used by MANY: parents with strollers, joggers, bikers, hikers and dog walkers alike to be able to access the lake. Adding through traffic and removing more trees in this area would have a very negative impact to the neighborhood. Overall, it would be incredibly costly to taxpayers, provide a worse travel time for FD25 (worse by 50%), and hurt the neighborhood. Talking to neighbors, we STRONGLY oppose this connection. The residents have chosen this area to escape the traffic noise, have a safe area for their children, and enjoy the nature Kirkland has to offer; T47.1 opposes the neighborhood values. We urge you to see the impact of this and use common sense and remove T47.1.
T47.1	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	As a household that would be significantly affected by this T47.1, We would to see an environmental impact report and a diminished value analysis and a reimbursement/buyout plan for our house and land if development proceeds.

T47.1	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	NE 130th Pl narrows to a one-lane road with no options for pullout and passing of vehicles traveling in opposite directions. It is totally encumbered by private property and a steep wooded ravine with a designated waterway. expanding this road would be a detriment to the sensitive wooded critical area as well as create a safety hazard with unnecessary traffic that doesn't provide for two-way flow. This connection should not happen.
T47.1	Online Comment	16-Oct-19	This is an unstable slide-prone and watershed area. There is no reason to develop and/or add a road in this sensitive area.
T47.1	Email	14-Oct-19	<p>I am a proud resident of Kirkland. I have made a life in Kirkland and have lived here for almost a decade.</p> <p>After reviewing the v.1.5 Citywide Transportation proposal, I have found an area of deep concern with the connection T47.1. This proposal concerns NE 130th Pl with 66th ave ne, and 70th ln ne in the Holmes Point area. This connection proposes putting a road on a geologically sensitive ravine where a hiking trail currently is.</p> <p>-Road issues- The road itself (NE 130th pl) is not two lanes wide, and much of it has been created through private development (not a development company, single home owners), and it is maintained privately by those homeowners. Expanding the road to two is impossible due to the creek that parallels this sensitive land. The end of the road is a driveway which was paid for by the homeowner.</p> <p>-Neighborhood impact- This area is currently used as a hiking trail. It is a low traffic zone that people rely on to be safe. The end of 130th has a very steep grade that contributes to blind spots on a single lane road. Even with the low traffic now, cars sometimes need to back down a very steep grade or up a steep grade without guard rails to allow one car to pass. Adding traffic to this area would make this even more dangerous. The neighbors of this area chose this location to have safe area for their children, and a peaceful place to preserve and enjoy nature. Adding this road would significantly hurt individuals and their home values. For the same reason that people choose Kirkland and Finn hill to make their lives, they do it with the belief that the environment around them will be preserved as much as possible.</p> <p>-Cost issues- The cost for developing this road would be a fortune. Previous public comments have mentioned that developers have looked into this area unsuccessfully. The benefit it provides does yield a positive value. Improving pedestrian access to this area is already underway from another development-it is an excellent walking trail, P48 is a good change that is cost effective, but T47.1 is incredibly harmful to the community.</p> <p>-Environmental Impact- This is a landslide hazard area which crosses over a stream and a critical stormwater drainage system (of which, if it fails will cause irreparable damage). Removing trees from this area, and the development work itself has geological as well as biological impacts. The properties adjacent to this area are flagged as being in a geologically hazardous/sensitive area. Let's keep it as stable as we can.</p> <p>I very strongly urge you to remove T47.1 as a consideration due to the environmental, safety, and neighborhood concerns. If you are not concerned after reading this, I encourage you to put on your hiking shoes and see the area for yourself to truly understand how it would effect the environment and community. I sincerely appreciate your time, hard work, and consideration.</p>
T46	Online Comment	25-Sep-19	Really dumb idea. You have this new stub street funnel right into a tight corner on 129th Street. Kids school walkway and blind curve makes for huge mistake. Lets use our head here. Instead of a street, a short walk way would work. Please go out and look at this around 3PM on weekday when school buses start to drop kids at Holmes Point and 129th ST and watch.
T46 A50	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I strongly oppose the ill-conceived street connection and partial sidewalk that has been identified for 63rd Ave NE and 64th Ave NE by city staff. This proposal negatively impacts not just the families who chose to live on a quiet cul-de-sac, but it also threatens neighboring property owners by downgrading the unique character of the entire Holmes Point neighborhood. Aside from this cut-through being completely unnecessary, it is an appalling abuse of authority to target a random homeowner and force this family to fund the project. Making a building permit contingent upon an individual homeowner agreeing to pay for a city project which is exorbitantly expensive, purposeless, and undesirable defies all notions of responsible, responsive government. If the city had sound reasoning behind this specific proposal, that evidence should have been presented to the public and, if found to be beneficial to the character of the neighborhood and traffic circulation, it should be funded by the city. Forcing a single resident to fund such a disturbingly illogical project in exchange for a building permit is unjust and tantamount to extortion. Good local government is collaborative, not about a few officials ruling by decree. It is about working with local citizens toward positive long range goals, not about a handful of petty bureaucrats arrogantly imposing their will. Going forward, piecemeal proposals and wider-reaching master plans that disproportionately target individual residents and powerfully impact the character of Kirkland neighborhoods must be clearly revealed in writing and presented publicly to local residents in order to gain insight and input from them.
T46	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Pedestrian connection is good. Gravel works good. Need pervious. Sight distance issue for proposed connection
T46	Online Comment	24-Sep-19	I urge you to respond to the many comments of opposition that have been send regarding this connection and eliminate it from the map. This proposed connection does not meet any of the criteria that the City has established. Furthermore it would remove a pedestrian connection which is in conflict with city policy.
T46	Online Comment	14-Jun-19	<p>I am a homeowner who resides on 63rd Ave NE. Eight homes abut 63rd Ave NE and there is minimal traffic. A well used pedestrian trail allows access to 129th street. The street is flat and is a safe place for the neighborhood children to ride bikes and walk.</p> <p>A connection to 129th Street does not meet the City's criteria for a new road connection. It will not reduce congestion (there are no congestion issues) and it will not reduce travel time to places of work, shopping or schools. It is my understanding that the connection is not being requested by fire or police and that emergency service response time to 63rd Ave NE is adequate without the proposed connection. The connection will not make travel to local schools safer.</p> <p>If not already performed by the City, I request that a sight distance analysis be prepared to confirm that a car traveling eastbound on 129th Street that wishes to turn west onto the proposed connection to 63rd Ave NE can be done safely. 129th bends sharply at this location and there may not be adequate sight distance.</p> <p>My view is that a road connection provides minimal resilience benefit, if any, has drawbacks to the neighborhood and is not warranted. This is not a good use of public funds or private funds. Thank you.</p>
T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Accomplishes none of the criteria in the video. Already existing foot path. Does not facilitate first responders, currently a quiet cul-de-sac with a well maintained pathway. Please respect the neighborhood character.
T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Please do not connect this street. New walking path just enhanced by building at adjacent new house.

T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Driveways will be impacted (safety) by thru road
T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	NE 129th Street significant # of school age children walking to bu/less on 130th
T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Significant increase of DPS, such as UPS, delivery services traffic, Amazon, UPS, this year
T46	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Through traffic will be very dangerous on this road (63rd Ave NE)
T46	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	We are writing to you today to express our <b>EXTREME OPPOSITION</b> to creating a thru street on 63 <sup>rd</sup> Ave NE and NE 129 <sup>th</sup> St in the Holmes Pt area of Kirkland. We have lived in our home for 18 years and during that time, we have enjoyed a quiet, peaceful setting on our dead end street. We purchased our home knowing that it was a safe, quiet place to raise a family, as did many of our neighbors. We have developed a wonderful sense of community on our street; it's a place where family picnics occur, where children learn to ride their bikes, where neighbors visit while taking breaks from doing yardwork. In general, a wonderful "neighborhood" that Kirkland should be proud of. If you have ever walked down our street, you would ask the same question all of our neighbors are asking...WHY put a street through when there is no need to do so??? We challenge you to do that. There is <b>very little traffic</b> down our street on a normal day. Spending money to put in a thru street, widen the road and place sidewalks would only add cement to the landscape and nothing else, not to mention the fact that you would have plenty of upset homeowners. In a time where the environment is a major focus for many, including the City of Kirkland, it seems irresponsible to take down a number of large, mature trees and then spend dollars on projects that tear apart people's yards and lives, pour cement and then put things back together again like some Legoland building project. Don't spend money and change people's landscapes where there isn't a need to do so. ASK OUR NEIGHBORS!!! They will all agree. If city resources are to be spent widening streets and putting in sidewalks, we would hope the city would prioritize those areas where the maximum benefit would be achieved in relationship to the dollars spent. As a member of the Holmes Point Dog Walking Club, we have walked our two dogs for the last 18 years along all of the streets in this area. On many occasions during those walks, we have felt our safety has been at risk, and it was <b>never on 63<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE</b> . On two occasions we have filed reports with the police expressing our concerns regarding our safety during our walks. It would be prudent of the city council to communicate with the community and the police department to identify areas where safety could be improved, rather than just randomly placing thru streets and sidewalks where there is very little traffic and no need for them. I believe that the City of Kirkland could be liable if they choose to ignore addressing areas that have already been reported as unsafe and use community resources to "improve" areas in which it's unclear that there would be any benefit. <b>Please exercise some common sense and oppose creating a thru street on 63<sup>rd</sup> Ave NE and NE 129<sup>th</sup>. We have many more important details to attend to in the City of Kirkland. THIS is not one of them.</b>
T46	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I recently learned about a proposal to extend 63rd Ave NE to connect with NE 129th Street – replacing a neighborhood maintained gravel/grassy pedestrian path with a paved road and sidewalk. I am opposed to this "connector" through road being built. I do not see the point in building this connector road. 63rd Ave NE gets very little vehicular traffic. There are no issues with using NE 130th Street to access Holmes Point Drive from 63rd Ave NE. There is no need for vehicular access to NE 129th Street from 63rd Ave NE. Also, 63rd Ave NE meets NE 129th Street on a big curve, almost 180 degrees. I strongly believe you would be introducing a safety issue if cars could enter and leave NE 129th Street at this point. I have lived in the neighborhood for almost 20 years. I am always very cautious driving NE 129th St at this point, watching out for kids walking to/from the school bus stop at NE 129th St/Holmes Point Drive, neighbors taking their daily walks with their dogs to Denny Park and cars coming in the opposite direction on this narrow road. Our neighbors have communicated many times over the years to be careful driving NE 129th St with pedestrians, especially during the dark winter mornings and asking people to slow down. I don't think it is a good idea to add another variable to this existing safety issue. It definitely seems like money not well spent to make 63rd Ave NE a through road. Personally, I have no need for a vehicular road at that point and would not use it. It would certainly have a negative impact to our neighborhood putting in a road. The current cul de sac for 63rd Ave NE gives kids a safe place to play and ride their bikes. I heard that the proposal includes widening 63rd Ave NE, meaning houses on 63rd Ave NE between NE 129th and NE 130th would lose several feet of their property to put in this unnecessary road and sidewalk. This would impact at least 4 very old large cedar/pine trees on our property. It would certainly change the forest look that our neighborhood loves and impact the feeling of privacy to our home. Please remove 63rd Ave NE from the connector road plan for Finn Hill. It is not needed and not a welcomed improvement to our neighborhood.
T46	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I understand that on Thursday, 8/24 there will be a discussion about building a connecting road extending 63rd Ave NE between 129th Place and 130th Place. My husband and I are opposed to this proposal. This sounds like a well intentioned proposal executed from looking at a map or considering a set of policies without consideration for the cost or benefits involved. Spending money to connect 2 dead end roads that are already served via Holmes Point Drive, about 500 feet away seems very unnecessary. A second consideration that can't be understood by looking at a map is understanding how 63rd Ave is used today. Children play on the street regularly without fear of cars coming through from the south end of the street. Personally, I have a child with Autism and intentionally chose a home on a cul de sac to increase safety. It is my understanding that there is a second, younger child with Autism who also lives along this path and regularly rides his bike back and forth on 63rd Ave NE. I would encourage the city to invest these resources in another project that is considered a necessity. May I suggest special education services? Resources are so tight. It would be a waste of taxpayer dollars to extend 63rd Ave NE.
T46	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	Here I have my biggest concerns. You gave an explanation that firefighters and police could arrive faster. Well, this is true for just 4 houses on 63rd Ave; did you ask the owners? The remainder of the street is better served via 130th Ave. My question is how many seconds faster a fire truck - if the connection is realized - would need to get to 12917 63rd Ave NE, the most Southern house on the cul de sac. This gain in speed for a very rare event needs to be seen in context against: Loss of a cul de sac that is used for games and children. Loss of canopy. Loss of property area for the adjacent owner. Increased sealing of the soil. Moving an electric pole. Establishing a critical 3 way crossing in the midst of the turn of 129th St leading to higher accident risk. Last not least, sizeable cost that either the affected owners or the city (I do not know the rules there) must bear
T46	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	This proposed connection would build a safe cul-de-sac where kids play. This is a very low-traffic neighborhood, and there is a nice pathway in existing right of way. Topographically there are challenges that also would make the cost very high for a short connection. There is a need I believe based on feedback about this connection to remove from the proposed plan. I want to better understand the process for how that decision would be made.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	The connection only connects two dead end streets - with very few houses on them - so the benefit is not wide spread.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	The existing pedestrian and bicycle connection is the only place for kids in the neighborhood to practice riding bikes - that is flat and no hilly.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Would create a blind corner on 129th - because of the bend in the road.

T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Kids walk down both 129th and 130th to get to Holmes Point Drive - so creating a vehicle connection here will make it less safe for the kids to walk to the school bus or park.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Would take away from a very nice quiet place (away from the busy Holmes Point Drive) for the neighborhood.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	It would make sense if this was a mega block connection but it isn't. It just connects two dead end streets and only 1+ block off Holmes Point Drive.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Neighborhood fears this happening because it is triggered by the 1948 house being rebuilt (which is very likely).
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Doesn't meet any of the criteria; 1) no reduction in emergency response time - everyone was required to put in sprinkler systems because of the response time in this area and the cul-de-sac is already large enough for a fire turnaround; 2) opening a automobile street will make it less safe for children walking down the hill on either street to the bus; 3) there is no congestion and no redevelopment causing more traffic; 4) redundancy is only slightly beneficial and doesn't outweigh the benefits of the quiet walking/biking connection - doesn't make any difference in driving to work, shopping, school etc. - as you end up on Holmes Point Drive anyway.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Who would use it? Not residents - perhaps UPS, deliveries, or boat trailer traffic as they wait to launch at the boat launch. All of these would make it unsafe for children and the neighborhood to walk along the connection.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Don't make it all about cars. This will destroy the walkability of our neighborhood.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Consider the value of cul-de-sacs to a neighborhood - socially, ecologically, naturally.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Concern around Bond for half the street already done by the property to the east. Staff answered questions about how they will be impacted by a decision to do or not to do this connection.
T46	Site Visit	24-Jul-19	Concerns around the LWSD bus stop at the southeast corner of 129th and Holmes Point Drive. Staff is following up as part of the Safer Routes to School Action Plan City Council initiative.
T46	Email	24-Jul-19	Thank you for your attendance at our community meeting tonight. We appreciate your efforts to hear our concerns with respect to the proposed street connection at 63rd Ave NE and NE 130th Pl. I only wish that more council members could have been present to witness our passion and commitment in keeping our neighborhood safe, serene, environmentally and ecologically sound, all with a common sense approach. As we discussed, the connector that is proposed does not meet any of the four criteria laid out by the City of Kirkland to substantiate moving forward with a street connection. It's that simple. Our area would be much better served with a pedestrian walking path, as it stands now. Thank you again for your time and attention to this matter. Please do the right thing and keep our street a cul-de sac. There are so many more benefits to a cul-de-sac than there are to constructing a thru-street where no one wants one.
T46	Email	13-Jun-19	My wife and I have been living in the Holmes Point neighborhood for the past 20 years, living on 63rd Ave NE the entire time. We are writing to you today regarding the proposed connection of 63rd Ave NE with NE 129th St. On your most recent draft of the Citywide Connection map, it is noted as connection T-46. We are in strong opposition to this proposed connection, and would like this proposed connection to be removed from the current draft. When this topic came up in August of 2017, many of our neighbors wrote letters and emails voicing their concerns about this same connection issue. Since all of our feelings have not changed in the last year and a half, I am attaching all of those letters and a petition signed by over 20 people for you to review once again. I would encourage you to read each of these letters and when given an opportunity to vote on this issue, vote to remove T-46 (63rd Ave NE and NE 129th St.) from the Final Draft of the Citywide Connection Map.
T46	Email Attachments	13-Jun-19	<a href="#">Email attachments referenced in above 13-Jun-19 email regarding T46.</a>
T46	Mail	14-Jun-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding T46</a>
T45	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	In support, public across
T43	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T43—North of T43, a lot of additional roads. Doesn't see how this connection eases anything as it parallels NE 124 <sup>th</sup> street. Earlier question as what constitutes redevelopment wasn't answered. Next iteration would help address this question.
T42	Email	16-Nov-19	Please keep T42. Please extend west, T52 to where it would meet up with P48. Since P48 will be cut. Move P48 south to NE 129th Street to connect with Holmes point/ NE129th Street. There is already a full dirt/gravel road there just fallen trees across it and a home owner that put bushes along the road which they thought was their driveway.
T42	Public Hearing comment 1	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T42	Public Hearing comment 2	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T42	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	I just left the public forum with the planning commission thank you for having us. On my way home, on 124th st, I passed a 4 pt buck. Beautiful he was. Please keep our neighborhoods neighborhoods. This thru connection would change to a much less desirable place to live.
T42	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	The topography and geology of this area makes this connection impractical and cost prohibitive. It should be removed from the list. A pedestrian access does make sense.

T42	Email	27-Oct-19	<p>We were unable to attend the recent planning committee meeting, but echo Rhoda and Robert's sentiments. We live at the termination of 124th where it meets 93rd Ave NE. While we have only lived in our home since 2011, we have poured our hearts into the restoration and preservation of the historic nature of the structure. Likewise, our neighbors the Arnold family have spent years restoring their home which, like ours, is one of the original bungalows on 93rd Ave. NE. T42 would most likely lead to the condemnation of our homes.</p> <p>We are pleased to hear that conceptual connections will be removed from the map. These conceptual connections are emotional and functional albatrosses that hang over properties effected by a concept that is most likely not feasible. Any "grand vision" to connect 124th east and west would not only be a tragic use of beautiful land which would require environmental impact studies, the engineering and construction of the project would be profound. Connection of east and west Finn Hill is not worth impacting the beauty of the area which was the reason we chose to live here. Sitting in traffic on Juanita Drive is the cost for the topographic beauty. For those who don't see the same cost/benefit, they should simply consider if this area is indeed where they wish to live.</p> <p>At the same time, we understand that our city is growing and infrastructure needs to catch up to the rapid growth. Schools, roads and other public spaces are nearing capacity (in the case of our schools- past capacity). We implore the council and city planners to consider ways to manage growth of the city responsibly while balancing property rights of its citizens.</p> <p>Thank you for working with us on the T42 connection. We also invite anyone who would like to visit our property to contact us to arrange a site visit. We would also like the link to the information distribution list for the city connections and any public studies that impact our property. Unlike Rhoda, we never received notification of the public meetings nor any information on the connections project that deeply impacts our home.</p>
T42	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	I agree that T42 would be good for fire and emergency services access, but I am very concerned about the impact on residential neighborhoods and schools, as I think this new connection would become a major artery for traffic travelling between I-405 and 522. Also the grade of this extension of 124th could pose problems due to speed and weather conditions.
T42	Online Comment	22-Oct-19	This project would give us a vital connection to hospitals and medical services to the west part of Finn Hill. In addition to supporting the Fire and Police Departments in achieving maximum efficiencies during emergencies. It would also alleviate the traffic congestion on Juanita Drive, which during emergencies could prove catastrophic. I support the attempt to connect us all as one neighborhood in a city of many neighborhoods. Please consider this project at your earliest convenience. Thanks!
T42	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	<p>This is crazy. Besides being one of if not the largest engineering feats in Kirkland, Fire Trucks couldn't even make it up or down the steep grade.</p> <p>I live on 124th street and witness hundreds of people walking their dogs and kids daily. This connection would increase noise and decrease safety along 124th. It would change the essence of the entire neighborhood.</p> <p>City Council you have a responsibility to improve our property values. Not decrease them with continued development.</p>
T42	Online Comment	17-Oct-19	This connection is not feasible from a topographic perspective. Additionally, relocation and improvement of fire stations have made this potential "safety route" for improved response times unnecessary. In terms of a grand vision for east/west connection, again the environmental impact and costs associated with a project of this nature render it so conceptual, that it should be removed from the connections map. This connection goes through homes that while historic, have been restored and modernized bringing the character of the past into the present. Potentially condemnation of these homes would be devastating to the families who have put not only significant financial investments into our homes but have deep emotional importance to us. Frankly, as we as homeowners have improved and expanded these homes, it would have been nice for someone in city hall to let us know what the city's thoughts were as we obtained multiple permits over the course of a few years. Something like, "hey, before you spend that \$200,000 on this project you might want to know that we are considering putting a road through your house."
T42	Online Comment	11-Oct-19	As a household that would be greatly affected by this potential road, we would like to see engineering maps and plans, environmental impact reports. We also want to see details of how diminished value will be reimbursed to those houses affected, will we be offered a buy out price for our home if this road does indeed come through.
T42	Online Comment	21-Jun-19	This connection would create a street with a 26% grade. That's almost as steep as the steepest street in the US.
T42	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Need more information on how this could be done
T42	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Physically impossible
T42	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Great link between Juanita and Finn Hill especially for Finn Hill Middle School
T42	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	As a home owner on 124th, I adamantly oppose this connection. Besides the engineering feat, the environmental impact which are very concerning; I am very concerned that traffic patterns will change greatly and be redirected through our neighborhoods not designed or meant for this traffic. Main roads are designed for this and if they are not sufficient to handle the traffic or emergency vehicles, the city of Kirkland should have thought about that before annex and further development of the area.
T42	Online Comment	16-Oct-19	<p>This connection is infeasible for many reasons. Firstly, the Engineering challenges are insurmountable due to the very very steep slope. The slope goes well beyond the 12% grade that is required for a safe build. Also, the environmental impact would be tremendous with all the trees that would need to be removed. The tree removal would deem the hillside unstable for all the homes on and below the beginning of the connection of 124th down to 93rd. This connection is no longer necessary as fire stations have now been expanded since this connection was proposed many many years ago. There</p> <p>Will be a brand new fire station across from Juanita Elementary school which would be able to access these parts of Finn Hill much easier than a connector between 124th and 93rd and there's also a new fire station on Juanita Drive That also serves the area. The proposal that includes the 124th connector was part of the big visionary plan/part of the statement of vision without being vetted, reviewed, or proper engineering analysis done. It is longer necessary or tenable to even consider this connection and we recommend that it be dropped from the proposal all together as it is simply legacy.</p>

T42, T35	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>Is the T42 or T35 connections even possible to provide acceptable grades for emergency access? Has there been any analysis to show this is possible? If not, don't include unrealistic connections on the map that will never get built and focus on connections that are realistic and add value.</p>
T42	Email	17-Oct-19	<p>Dear Council Members:</p> <p>It was a pleasure to meet some of you at the Kirkland City Town Hall Study Session Meeting on October 15 as well as at the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance Meeting of October 16th which among other topics addressed the City of Kirkland's Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p> <p>We are the residents at 8826 NE 124th Street, directly adjacent to the location of T42 Conceptual Connection, and have owned our home since 1986. We had not heard about T42 until this week when we received the postcard announcing the planning meeting earlier this week. As homeowners who would be greatly impacted by such a road, even if it is characterized as a 'Conceptual' plan, we were very dismayed!</p> <p>We have included our comments to T42 on the Citywide Transportation Connections Map but we thought it would be beneficial to provide additional comments to you directly.</p> <p>It was reassuring to hear reasoned comments and analysis by Council Members and concerned neighbors, and we were pleased that all comments were definitively opposed to the T42 proposed Conceptual Connection.</p> <p>This Connection is infeasible on several grounds as you will have heard from the various comments at the Meetings as well as comments provided by others on the Citywide Transportation Connections Map.</p> <p>There are many reasons why this proposed road would be infeasible and unnecessary (engineering challenges including steep slopes- A grade which greatly exceeds the 12% grade allowance; the severe environmental impact; necessary extensive tree removal which would render the hill unstable; such a connection is now unnecessary with the addition of two nearby and accessible fire stations- Juanita Drive and across from Juanita Elementary school; traffic impact to neighbors; safety issues for residents with heavy traffic congestion; exorbitant costs involved; proximity to Juanita Heights park, etc.).</p> <p>We advocate to have this Connection removed from the Citywide Transportation Map all together as it is infeasible; and no proper analysis or engineering review was performed when it was originally included as a potential connection. It also appears to be superfluous in light of current day changes and improvements to fire station access.</p> <p>Thank you for your service to the City and the community and I look forward to seeing you at future meetings.</p> <p>Many thanks for your consideration of our concerns.</p> <p>Best Regards,</p>
T41	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	<p>There is an undeveloped wooded lot on 89th Ave NE and another on 87th Ave NE that recently had a lot line adjustment made so that it could be developed separately from the home in the lot to the north. These two lots connect to each other and could provide a pedestrian/bicycle path between Finn Hill and Goat Hill communities. All other routes are either long wooded routes or involve travel on Juanita Drive. This would be far shorter/cheaper than other proposals I have heard of for connecting these communities.</p> <p>If the city were to obtain an easement through these lots (or purchase them outright), it would facilitate connecting these communities, allowing Finn Hill residents a safe path to the Juanita Beach area, and allow Goat Hill residents to walk/bike to Finn Hill schools, for example.</p> <p>Gated access for emergency responders might be possible, but opening it up for any vehicle access would gravely alter traffic flows and disturb local residents, on multiple streets that don't have high traffic flows now. So I would object to any public vehicle access on route T41, however pedestrian/bike access is truly needed.</p>
T41	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	<p>I object!</p> <p>It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map.</p> <p>Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route.</p> <p>The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding.</p> <p>The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development.</p> <p>Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents.</p> <p>It would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods.</p>

T41	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	<p>Subject T41: Enabling T41 will divert traffic through currently quite and safe neighborhood. The connection will not provide relief to the traffic on the Juanita drive, the Goat hill area has narrow streets that can easily congest. Will drive traffic close to the park on the back, where kids play and there is wild life</p>
T41	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	<p>This street connection would essentially become a shortcut to Juanita drive. This would increase traffic in a residential neighborhood significantly that could result in a significant increase in car / pedestrian accidents. This would also result in decrease property valuation for all in those neighborhood.</p>
T41, P33	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
T41, P32	Online Comment	23-Sep-19	<p>Regarding T41, I think a better connection would be to extend 89th Avenue NE due north to NE 124th St, for emergency and pedestrian access only. The west end of the Wu property through to the west side of Juanita Heights Park. Regarding P32, this is the "Billy Goat Trail". Love this idea, and I've heard nothing but positive feedback from Goat Hill and Finn Hill residents. Emergency and pedestrian route instead of T41, north from NE 121st Street and 89th Avenue NE to NE 124th Street.</p>
T41, P32	Emailed letter	11-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Letter with suggested replacement for T41 and comments on P32.</a></p>
T41, P32	Emailed letter	18-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Additional letter with suggested replacement for T41 and comments on P32.</a></p>
T41, P32	Email	18-Oct-19	<p>Dear Kirkland City Council,</p> <p>Thank you for the call to the public to identify and evaluate additional street connections in Kirkland.</p> <p>Goat Hill has an access issue which may fall within this charter. Access in and out of Goat Hill is often cut off due to trucks becoming stuck. Lately construction vehicles cause additional blockage. I estimate I encounter two per week, so more may occur. This has been compounded by an unofficial emergency access route (highlighted in yellow in the attached picture) being blocked by new homes breaking ground in the recent months. Understanding that it was not really meant as an emergency route, rather an easement for storm water drainage according to at least one adjacent property owner, it had given residents an emergency route.</p> <p>We fully support what John Ghilarducci has proposed "Street Connection: Replace Project T41" (and "Trail Connection: Billy Goat Trail (P32)") with the caveat that we need to define what an emergency is to those living in the neighborhood. Fire and medical are obvious, but getting to work, picking up kids from school and medical appointments may warrant access when an hour blockage cannot be endured. Perhaps a resident access code enabled bollard.</p> <p>Referring to the same picture highlighted in yellow between upper 89th PL NE and lower 90th Ave NE, while it may or may not be desirable to the adjacent property owners, I do wonder if this previously used emergency access might be made more official by the city, possibly as a temporary solution. The effort required to make it passable by most vehicles appears light. Of course, with the understanding that it would be returned to the adjacent property owners once something more permanent is put into place.</p>
T41, P32	Email	18-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Image referenced in above email.</a></p>
T41, P32	Email	17-Oct-19	<p>I am delighted to hear that the City of Kirkland is making a serious effort to provide street connections for the safety of our residents.</p> <p>I am very much in favor of an emergency access connection at the top of Goat Hill. The most doable route appears to be an extension of 89th Av NE. The other route, T41, is probably not going to work because the Finn Hill Meadows neighborhood is not interested in allowing that access.</p> <p>Emergency access is sorely needed here: I believe we have had at least one "stuck truck" a week this summer on our steep switchbacks, cutting off access to the top half of our neighborhood for one to several hours each time. Should a fire or medical emergency occur up the hill during one of these blockages, we are in trouble! I do believe that the access should be emergency vehicle only, with a gravel surface usable by pedestrians. In addition to "stuck trucks", we have had inexperienced drivers go over the edge of the road several times in the past year too. The space available for the road doesn't allow for much widening or leveling out, so keeping travel volume low is important.</p> <p>Access to Finn Hill would reduce vehicle traffic on the hill by giving kids a walking/bicycling route to school. We have a lot of kids up here who take a 3-mile bus ride to Finn Hill Elementary, which is only about a mile away if you could walk straight up 89th Av.</p> <p>In regard to pedestrian routes, I also am in favor of the "Billy Goat Trail", route P32 on your maps. What a pleasure it would be to walk between Finn Hill and Juanita Beach! Please do what you can to further this connection for healthier, happier, outdoorsy Kirklanders.</p> <p>Thank you!</p>
T41 P33	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I wanted to state my concern with the street connection plan. I understand that most is contingent on future development taking place but as a homeowner certain connections seem not worthwhile. I live in the property just north of 19A. All 19, 19A and 20 seem to not make sense at least from a fire department management efficiency whereas access through 18 would be more direct and less disturbing with turns, blind spots, etc. I am unable to make the meeting tonight but please record my opposition to this plan or whatever you do.</p>
T41 P33	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>petition against CAM15-01754's proposed street amendments #18, 19, 19A, and 20. My mother, and I missed the chance to sign her petition before it was submitted to the City Council. Please do not take the home; there must be a better way of improving residential access to this area than building over someone's residence. Thank you very much for your consideration.</p>

T41 P33	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	This email relates to the Street Connections 18, 19, 19A, and 20. Enclosed are signatures of residents who live in the immediate area of the potential connections. The (50) signatures were gathered by resident, who owns a home at 12024 86th Ave NE, adjacent to one of the connections. These names are in addition to the residents of Finn Hill Meadows, on whose behalf I sent a letter previously. We understand that the connections are "development driven", and these may never come to pass, but we still want you to know our position. We appreciate your consideration.
T41 P33	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<a href="#">Petition regarding T41 and P33</a>
T41, P33	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	T41 - Strongly oppose. Would increase traffic on an otherwise quiet cul-de-sac. P33 - residents currently enjoy the privacy of cul-de-sac. Making it into a complete circle is simply not necessary.  Both would negatively impact property values.
T41, T35	Email	19-Nov-19	I won't be able to make the meeting tonight, but wanted to let you know that I support the staff recommendation to do a study of Goat Hill safety and connections. Complex issue that we can hopefully resolve with some study. Thank you.
T41, T35	Email	19-Nov-19	Like John I won't be able to make the meeting tonight and also, like John, I agree with his perspective. This connection is too important for the safety of Goat Hill and the connections initiative. I'm sure your staff did a thorough job researching the possible cost for the connections. I ran it by a contractor/associate/friend who does this type of construction for a living. He thought the \$20 million was pretty high. I wonder what it would take to just put out a request for proposal and see where the numbers come in at. My friend also talked about how all the new regulations do price drive prices up. But he joked, that if this were the 60s, could have it finished in a week.
T41	Online Comment	19-Jun-19	I suggest that T41 be replaced with an emergency vehicle / bike ped connection from the corner of 89th Ave and NE 121st St (the SE end of the T41 line) due north along the western edge of the WU properties (currently for sale) and the eastern edge of Juanita Heights Park to NE 124th St (possibly by linking up with 89th Ave NE at the northwest corner of the park. There are several advantages to this connection: it could provide ingress and egress in emergencies; it would provide a safe route to schools from Goat Hill; it is feasible -- right of way and partial street construction could be negotiated with the sale of the Wu properties leaving the City with construction responsibility in currently owned City property (Juanita Heights Park).
T41	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I attended the session at Finn Hill Middle School last night, October 10th. My wife and I own the property at the West end of Proposed Route 19. My address is 12042 87th Ave NE. You and your team should consider comparing your maps, particularly before releasing the proposals. The map of steep slopes, where slopes greater than 40% are marked in red, should be compared with the proposed routes. Route 19 lines up directly along a slope greater than 40%. I think parts of the path are more like 60%. Now, you removed the alternate Route 19. That was good since it ran directly through my septic drain field, master bedroom, living room, and kitchen. Quite an inconvenience. Proposed Route 18 is equally as impractical. If you look at the map of steep slopes, Route 18 runs perpendicular to 2 steep slopes that make the ravine adjacent to my land. It has to be 5 stories deep. To complete 18 would take a steel bridge. It is very steep.
T41	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	Saw the proposed street additions to Finn Hill. In particular have concerns with 18, 19, and 19a. The safety of our children due to increased traffic, the miss match of the complexity of building a new road in the steepest category even in the cities maps using tax payer funds seems to be misaligned. The loss in value of the homes in our cul-de-sac and on Goat Hill. We would see a massive influx of traffic from Finn Hill down to Goat Hill and Goat Hill upward. Now impacting the entire route. As people would use that route to avoid traffic down Juanita Road. While we understand the fire department would like to have easier access to the top of "valuable goat hill" we don't believe it should be at the detriment of our lives and homes. A better solution would be to solve for fire access with the existing roads to goat hill and a cheaper option with less risk to our children both for goat hill and our cul-de-sac. We kindly request removal of that proposed route of 18, 19 and 19a.
T41	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am a Finn Hill resident and I want to formally oppose the Finn Hill street connections proposed in the planning document dated Sept 7, 2017. The connections specifically for 19 and 19A shown in attachment 1 from the document will dramatically change the character of the neighborhood with a substantial increase in traffic, at higher speeds. There will be an increase in noise and pollution and some property owners will also lose some or all of their homes to this new construction, even though they have been good citizens for many years.
T41	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Too steep of terrain
T41	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Too steep of terrain
T41	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	At the end of NE 119th Street to 85th Avenue NE
T41	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T41- goat hill: supports a proposal that would replace T41. How does the process work to replace T41? Lots are for sale currently, provide emergency access and bike/ped routes that they don't have now.
T40	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	Strongly oppose, street is narrow and steep with 90 degree blind turns, puts kids a risk, will turn into short cut to major arterial Juanita Drive
T40	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	Strongly oppose connection T40. Will create dangerous shortcut to Juanita Drive through steep and narrow roads without any benefit (emergency vehicles can access through 120th St)
T40	Online Comment	7-Oct-19	T40 is definitely introducing risks to the neighborhood rather than adding convenience. The route is already super narrow and whenever turns, ppl needs to be extra cautious when turning at the corner.
T39	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T39	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	Strongly oppose, street is narrow and steep with 90 degree blind turns, puts kids a risk
T39	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	Strongly oppose connection T39. Will create dangerous shortcut to Juanita Drive through steep and narrow roads without any benefit (emergency vehicles can access through 120th St)

T39	Online Comment	24-Sep-19	Please do not open T39 to vehicular traffic. Significant cut-thru traffic would impact portions of NE 120th Street and 84th Avenue NE, including a narrow section of 84th. Traffic on 84th already regularly exceeds the speed limit. Removable bollards to allow emergency access seems like a reasonable solution. But full removal would be a great mistake.
T39	Online Comment	2-Aug-19	I've read the recent comments regarding T39. One additional point to mention. To open up NE 120th St to through-traffic would require widening the lower portion of the street next to Juanita Woodlands; and to widen the street would require felling several old growth Fir trees. [I am opposed to the barrier's removal].
T39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I agree that the existing barrier is an eye sore. However, there was obviously a reason that it got installed, and you heard more statements during the last meeting. I understand there is a desire to be faster for police, fire department, and ambulance in an emergency. However, already now the crossing from 120th Pl NE to Juanita Dr is a critical crossing with several people ignoring the restrictions. This would be much worse if the barricade is removed, and could even lead to lost time for emergency vehicles. So, my suggestion is to replace the existing barrier with movable rising bollards. They not only look much nicer, but they have a dual purpose. They keep all regular traffic out; from what I heard this is the preference of the neighbors. And emergency vehicles could have a key to lower the bollards in seconds to pass. I intend to join your next meeting; thanks for your work and listening to the constituencies,
T39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T39- not the first time they have been to the city to discuss this. Fighting this battle for decades. The barricade can open. King County proposed removing it, City staff have captured comments-kudos), doesn't see why the city is bent on continuing to propose opening the street. The amount of time emergency services would save he estimates at 45 seconds. The lower portion of the road would have to be widened if this connection is opened west of the barricade down to Juanita drive. A very costly project, the disadvantages outweigh the advantages. The neighborhood likes the quietness the barricade provides, as it prevents people going to Juanita/schools. Don't want the traffic. Would appreciate it if the city would remove the general access proposal once and for all. <u>Deer do cross Ne 120<sup>th</sup> from Juanita woodlands.</u>
T39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T39- In 1999, when king county evaluated opening, they said they couldn't because major revisions were necessary for the intersection, due to sight lines. This is one of the most dangerous intersections, with fatalities. This is with the barricade in place, removing the barricade only increases the risk. Mentions the king county conservation district would need to be worked with/looked at.
T39	Email	15-May-19	<p>It has again come to my attention that removal of the emergency services access gate (barricade) on NE 120th St, just east of 80th PL NE, has been cited again in the current Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan draft proposal (as a "street connection"). This is getting quite infuriating. I'm getting sick and tired of having to come down to City Hall every other year to protest this same proposal. How many times do we have to go through this before the Planning Commission gets it?!!! Our neighborhood has been unanimously and unequivocally opposed to the barricade removal from day one. Why does the City persist at going against our wishes and repeatedly trying to force this unwanted [and unnecessarily costly] change on us? Who is responsible for this repeated "harrassment"?</p> <p>Below is essentially a rehash of the comments I sent previously.</p> <p>My family has lived on 80th PL NE since 1989. We would be quite AGAINST removal of this gate. The primary reason would be that opening NE 120th St would turn it into a major through street for cars travelling between Juanita Drive and access to Carl Sandburg elementary, Finn Hill Middle School, stores in "downtown" Juanita (100th Ave NE), and a commuting route to I-405—in effect re-characterizing a quiet set of side streets into a through street for drivers who want to bypass the traffic lights located on Juanita Drive at NE 122nd PL (and presumably MANY would if they could). In addition, this makes a dangerous section of Juanita Drive even more hazardous; not to mention deer are frequently seen on NE 120th St coming out of Juanita Woodlands. Prior to our neighborhood's Kirkland incorporation, King County evaluated this same option to remove the barricade when new residences above/east of the barricade were developed. Removal of the barricade along with widening of NE 120th St, just off of Juanita Drive, was suggested by the County, but neighborhood residents' pushback, with Count Councilwoman Jane Hague's help, resulted instead in replacing the immovable barricade that existed at the time with an opening gate accessible by emergency services.</p> <p>Then in August of 2015 the City proposed removing the barricade; and again our neighborhood vehemently opposed such a move; and worked with Shelley Kloba and Jon Pascal to get the proposal dropped. Then again in August of 2017 the City proposed removing the barricade; and again our neighborhood vehemently opposed such a move; and protested at the Planning Commission meeting to get the proposal dropped—which we had hoped put this issue to rest; but here it comes again!! The notion of removing this barricade was and still is a terrible idea. It's presence has never posed a problem in the 30 years I have lived here. I would like nothing better than to see this notion of the barricade removal dropped once and for all, as its removal provides no value to anyone living in the affected neighborhoods. I have no doubt that if you lived here you would feel the same.</p>
T39	Email	14-May-19	<p>Unfortunately I am not able to make the meeting tomorrow due to a work travel conflict, however I wanted to voice more support of the email and information provided to you by my neighbor Rebecca Chu. We are hoping our feedback can be shared with city staff as well. Over the past few years, our neighbors and us have had an active voice as the City evaluates options to improve access on Finn Hill, particularly as it affects the community around the barrier at NE 120th St &amp; 80 Pl NE (#T39 on the V1 map.) We've raised multiple concerns about the impact of opening the barrier supported by the Juanita Corridor Study. The intersection of NE 120th St and Juanita is a collision hazard concern and was the original reason the barrier was put in.</p> <p>We are all happy to see the current 2019 version of the plan limits the access of this intersection / barrier traffic to emergency services. What is less clear though - is what that means. I recall some earlier discussions with the City about replacing the barrier with a movable bollard. Are there any other concepts in the 2012 Fire Department Strategic Plan that explain how the City would alter the barrier for the purposes of emergency services? I think Rebecca's suggestion is very sound, requesting the review of the 2012 Fire Department Strategic Vision at #T39 with its Juanita Corridor Study findings and other past documentation of the collision hazards at Juanita &amp; NE 120th Street. The City should ensure that any work associated with the 2012 Fire Dept document will address those known hazards. I'm sure the Fire Department would want to ensure it's proposed designs would support public safety; and the City similarly has that interest.</p>

T39	Email	20-May-19	<p>The 2012 Strategic Fire Department Plan was tasked with identifying connections to improve response times. It did not include traffic studies around installing these connections. Given the traffic issues posed by some of the connections: this is a significant safety issue the City must address before finalizing its Connection Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The 2014 Juanita Corridor Study provides some of that info. The NE 120th/Juanita intersection is a known collision hot spot because of site line distance issues.</li> <li>- The 2014 Juanita Corridor Study included community feedback about the concerns of collisions on Juanita. Approving this connection plan for NE 120 would contradict that stated community interest.</li> <li>- The 2014 Juanita Corridor Study also included community input that impacts to greenspace to improve traffic was unfavorable. Presumably improving the intersection would involve impacts to Juanita Woodlands.</li> <li>- The history behind why the barrier was installed - and remains - is available via King County Ordinances. It was installed because of the intersection hazards at Juanita in the 1970s. It remained because the collision hazards remained as the area developed. And in 2014 the Juanita Corridor Study found the hazards still exist. So it's a long known problem that still exists. It should be included in the calculus of creating this connection for the Fire Department Strategic Plan.</li> <li>- The affected neighborhood has provided multiple rounds of comments on the various City proposals to remove this barrier. The neighborhood is a community: our kids play here, we live here, we're the ones impacted by decisions made by those elsewhere. Anecdotally the neighbors talk about how someone once opened the barrier and NE 120th became a speedway for commuters trying to reach 84th. It has the potential to change the character of our community: a change decided by those who won't have to live with the impacts of the decision made.</li> <li>- A traffic study would also have to include the intersection of NE 120 and 84th. Opening passage of the barrier will incentivize commuters to bypass the lights via NE 120th. The intersection @ 84th is on a blind hill: traffic coming from the South over the hill is hard to see.</li> </ul>
T39	Email	14-May-19	<p>Over the past few years, my neighbors and I have had an active voice as the City evaluates options to improve access on Finn Hill. As residents within the community around the barrier at NE 120th St &amp; 80 Pl NE (#T39 on the attached map), we've raised multiple concerns about the impact of opening the barrier. Personally, I've been most concerned with the safety aspect given the findings of the Juanita Corridor Study identifying the intersection of NE 120th St and Juanita as a collision hazard because of the limits on sight line distance issues and recorded fatalities. I found the County documents outlining that it was these same safety concerns that resulted in the barrier installation.</p> <p>I'm very glad to see the current 2019 version of the plan limits the access of this intersection to emergency services. What is less clear though - is what that means. I recall some earlier discussions with the City about replacing the barrier with a movable bollard. Are there any other concepts in the 2012 Fire Department Strategic Plan that explain how the City would alter the barrier for the purposes of emergency services? I can't make the meeting Wed that Finn Hill Alliance is hosting with City staff. I'm hoping that you might be able to share this with the City staff as some public input. Specifically- the City should provide information that crosswalks the 2012 Fire Department Strategic Vision at #T39 with its Juanita Corridor Study findings and other past documentation of the collision hazards at Juanita &amp; NE 120th Street. The City should ensure that any work associated with the 2012 Fire Dept document will address those known hazards. I'm sure the Fire Department would want to ensure it's proposed designs would public safety; and the City similarly has that interest. Given the reality that agencies and offices can get stove piped: it's worth putting in place now the mechanism to coordinate.</p>
T39	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>My emailed comments sent on 8-31-2017 did not appear on your log of public comments so restating them here:</p> <p>I'm writing to express my concern about taking down the barrier on NE 120th St. on Finn Hill. I live on the corner of 79th Ave. NE and NE 120th St. – and have lived here for over 20 years.</p> <p>We bought this house because of the quite neighborhood and its proximity to the forest. Over the years, there have been several threats to our neighborhood. First we had to contend with the Chu Mansion being built up the street with its 25,000 square foot footprint, containing 24 toilets, 36 bathroom sinks, 18 showers and a ballroom – all for one family (or temple, depending on who you believe). Then there was the threat of putting in a development where Juanita Woodlands now stands. However, removal of the barricade has been a long standing threat that visits us over and over again. I for one am tired of living in an area that seems to be in constant need of protection from development.</p> <p>If the barricade were removed, then people trying to get from Juanita drive to 84th (or visa-versa) would use 120th to circumvent the light at 122nd, thereby increasing traffic through a residential neighborhood where houses are quite close to the road. Neighbors on 84th really do joke about living on “I-84” – it's gotten that busy, and Juanita drive is worse! Our driveway faces 120th (along with several others) and backing out is already a sometimes tricky proposition – without having even more traffic to contend with! Add to that, the noise which comes from increased traffic – which would be most unwelcome given that our deck looks out across 120th toward the woods.</p> <p>And what about the woods? This is a street where people walk up and down the hill for exercise. Why do they do that? Because it's quiet and peaceful! Deer come from the woods thru our cul-de-sac on their way to the woods on 122nd. How many trees would need to be cut down to widen the road? How many people will park along the side of the road to admire the woods? Would people really slow down due to the “traffic calming” methods, or barrel straight through to the bottom of the hill (a steep grade)?</p> <p>What do we gain from this? I take 122nd a lot, and very rarely encounter traffic of such a degree as to warrant opening 120th. What's the purpose of this “improvement”?</p> <p>I believe opening the barrier, and widening the road would decrease the value of our property and alter our way of life. If I wanted to live on a through street, I would have bought a house on one!</p> <p>I urge you all to reconsider this plan.</p> <p>It was suggested that there may be a way to install a "retractable barrier" at the intersection so that fire/police could access. I am in favor of this option.</p>

T39	Email	13-Jun-19	<p>Thank you for taking the time to meet today to discuss the barrier and the issues I think the City should consider in finalizing its Connections map. I have pulled together a bit of information about the history of the barrier from the ordinances passed by King County in 1977 and 1999. Those are attached to this email.</p> <p>Additionally, I raised concerns about what types of impacts any type of road improvements would have on Juanita Woodlands. As I understand it- this area is under the jurisdiction of King County (most recently referenced by King County in 2017 ordinance- attached). As I understand it- the Woodlands are the genesis of coordination between the neighborhood (Denny Creek Alliance- the precursor to Finn Hill Alliance) and King County. It looks like there were a series of funding agreements between the two to purchase the properties over time. There is also a 2005 Grant Agreement between Denny Creek Alliance and King County that have some specific requirements prescribed to the County (County's Commitments). Here's some language I'd like to highlight from the Grant Agreement:</p> <p>3.2 Protection of Property as Open Space: The County shall limit the future use of the Woodlands consistent with the open space restrictions and restrictions on alienation specified in chapter 84.24 of RCW at KC Ordinance No. 9071, 10750, 11068 and 14265 (together referred to as the "Conservation Laws"). Accordingly, the Woodlands must be maintained as required by the Conservation Laws as "open space land," . . .</p> <p>3.7 Assignment of Grant Agreement to Future Owners. . . .the County agrees to assign the requirements under this Grant Agreement to any future owners of the Woodlands or a portion of the Woodlands, such as the City of Kirkland, and to require assumption of the requirements under the Grant Agreement by that future owner as part of any such transfer..</p> <p>As with all agreements- there are exceptions and contingencies. That being said- it's important to consider the Agreement's overall intent to understand the expectations and interest the community has in the Juanita Woodlands. There are couple of other ordinances I found about the bonds and funding for Juanita Woodlands. Not all of this may be relevant for your purposes- but to help you toward your goal of more complete history of this site- it's attached. I'm also attaching an email from me to my neighborhood following up on a discussion with then City Council Member Kloba about the barrier removal in the CIP. She shared some information about the cost estimates and processes put together when the City was developing that document that might be helpful for you as well. Again, thank you for taking the time to stop by the neighborhood, look at the Site, and listen to my concerns. I appreciate the efforts by the City of Kirkland to ensure meaningful public involvement on the Connections project.</p>
T39	Email Attachments	13-Jun-19	<a href="#">Email attachments referenced in above 13-Jun-19 email regarding T39.</a>
T39	Email	29-May-19	I'm strongly opposed to the removal of the barrier on our street. I live on the corner of 81st & 120th. We've lived in our home for 16.5 years and believe it would be unsafe for cars navigating onto Juanita dr and pedestrians. There is history of fatalities and accidents at that intersection and worry about increasing risk.
T38	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Private easements came with the easements. Easements stay with the land. T38Juanita woodlands, King county conservation open space. Saved from development with funds from the conservation fund. West side had trails, east side is preserved for wildlife, rural feel in an urban area. Passive use.
T37	Email	16-Nov-19	<p>Dear Mayor Sweet and Council members,</p> <p>I would like to submit belated comments on three proposed street connections near my home on Champagne Point Road:</p> <p>-P41: This is a proposal for a pedestrian extension of Champagne Point Lane to Holmes Point Drive at a point where Holmes Point Drive curves up and away from the lake and towards the Juanita Woodlands. (Note that the textual description of the proposed connection refers erroneously to an extension of Champagne Point Road). The connection would provide access to Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous location for walkers and, in any event, would not be heavily used by neighbors because it would serve only a few homes on a short cul de sac. No neighbors have submitted comments in support of the proposal. It should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-P42: This is a proposal for pedestrian access from the lower portion of Champagne Point Road up a steep embankment in a high landslide hazard zone to access Holmes Point Drive on the same curve as is described above. No one has submitted comments in support of this proposed pedestrian route. It would be steep, would possibly destabilize the embankment, would probably be expensive to construct, and would access Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous point on the road for walkers (just like P41). This proposal should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-T37: This connection would extend 76th Avenue south along Juanita Woodlands Park to meet 73rd Place and 116th NE Street as they intersect with Holmes Point Drive. While a pedestrian route from this intersection to 76th Avenue might make sense, particularly if additional homes are constructed in the immediate vicinity, the extension of 76th for vehicular traffic would be highly problematic given the lack of sightlines at the intersection with Holmes Point Drive. Also, the proposed extension of 76th would not enhance vehicular connectivity in any meaningful way or abbreviate emergency response times. The record shows that most neighbors do not support a vehicular extension but generally favor only non-motorized access. This connection should be converted to a pedestrian/cycle route.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering these comments.</p>
T37	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T37	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	Potential street connection T37 would exacerbate the already dangerous intersection between NE 116 and Holmes Pt. Drive. That spot has limited sight distance due to the curve of Holmes Pt, and the slope of 116th, and because many drivers coming up Holmes Pt do so at excessive speed, that intersection is already a high risk for collisions. Furthermore drivers entering from T37 onto Holmes Pt would have poor visibility of traffic descending Holmes Pt. Residences north of T37 already have multiple routes to egress to Juanita Drive.
T37	Online Comment	26-Sep-19	This is to put it bluntly, a dumb idea. Opening up 76th Ave NE along the west side of the woodlands and connecting it to NE 116th St will funnel traffic south and to a very difficult intersection at Holmes Point Drive. This will result in a very unsafe traffic movement at that intersection with increased cars coming south.
T37	Online Comment	22-Jun-19	It is critical to add an additional exit point for the community.
T37	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	There is a bus stop at 76th Avenue NE and NE 121st Street. Lots of kids using this street. Traffic is already busy and lots of speeding.

T37	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	In support, person cannot block us.
T37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T37: 240 homes affected by this, 100 kids under the age of 18 who can't walk to school. 2 acres of land. Needs a small portion of land to connect two pathways. Why does one person... (its private property), has a petition of over 50 neighbors who want. (not going to sell the property, get it from another property owner)
T37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	(homeowner who lives there, do a site visit, and try to turn left at 3pm. Hard to see southbound turning onto Juanita drive. If you open that road, it increases traffic and people will try going down the hill on 120th)
T37	Online Comment	12-Oct-19	A bad idea. It would increase traffic to a very dangerous intersection at Holmes Point Drive
T35	Online Comment	22-Jun-19	Please have whoever suggested T35 come take a quick look at the physical location. It crosses two streams and a wetland and heads down a 30 degree slope. T35 is a physical impossibility. Don't waste time on it.
T35	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Too steep of terrain
T29.1, P23.2	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	Extend T29.1 to connect across to Slater Ave NE to the east.  P23.2 should be proposed as a full street and continue south to Slater Ave NE.  In general, we should create a plan for blocks that are closer to 200-300 feet in length in our planned urban areas (such as across the Totem Lake District) to support pedestrian activity, shorten street crossings (by having more short crossings rather than one big crossing), create more on-street parking, and create more storefront opportunities.  With 1800 feet between NE 116th St and NE 124th St, and 1800 feet between 405 and Slater (on average), we should be adding four to six more North/South avenues and East/West streets in this area.
T24	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T24	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	We would like to vote against it. Our street is small that isn't beneficial to open it up. Kids in the neighborhood have a safer environment to play in the cul de sac with lower traffic. Thank you
T24	Online Comment	22-Oct-19	As a neighborhood resident, I don't think having this connection helps. We will be uprooting trees for a pathway that is easily accessible by foot or car. Also, it will open up the neighborhood for traffic which can increase the risk for our children and pets.
T24	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	Connecting 124th streets will kill our neighborhoods. It will increase the speed of automobiles on 124th and create safety issues for all those who live and walk on 124th. I live on 124th and see adults, kids, and dogs walking every single day.
T24	Online Comment	12-Oct-19	This connection would eliminate a dead end in the Courtyards of Kirkland development. While I understand the reason it is considered, I would stress that this would make this very safe neighborhood less so. Especially, right now, in the absence of thru traffic, 116th DR NE and NE 117th ST are safe for the children in the neighborhood, and adjoining communities (Enclave and five no-HOA homes) to play. This would definitely change in the event the proposed connection should be realized. That's why I recommend not to follow up on this project.
T21.1	Online Comment	12-Oct-19	I believe that it is a done deal that the crossing at T21.1 with NE 116th ST will add a traffic light there, but I wonder if the already horrendous traffic conditions there have been considered. A light immediately following/preceding the major intersection with 120th Ave NE and I-405 is guaranteed to create a very bad backup every time E-W traffic builds up, which happens several times a day. After all, there is no light at the crossing with 114th PL NE, and that means long waits to leave the Enclave neighborhood, but, at least, it's not causing a huge backup on NE 116th ST.
T19	Emailed letter	18-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding T19</a>
T16	Online Comment	12-Jun-19	T16 - Great idea, there needs to be a connection between the Highlands and Forbes Creek Dr.
T16	Online Comment	11-Jul-19	The vast majority of neighbors in the Highlands do not want this connection. The people requesting this connection would be those who would use it as a pass through to avoid going through downtown Kirkland or using the freeways. This would increase congestion, crime, traffic in the neighborhood and serve no other purpose than an outlet for those outside the neighborhood to pass through. Please consider the quality of the neighborhood prior to opening this connection.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	If the City develops a cut through then the City would open up a traffic flow alternative to 405 and Market.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	People want to know if the City is proposing traffic or just fire
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Curious about police response, if fire truck access goes in, m concern is will police response time improve also? Will
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	The issue is: we don't want commercial vehicle pass through. No one opposed to EMR. We do have access from many main roads. But if City says we can't get to you from multiple stations within four minutes. The vehicle pass through is alternative to 405 traffic. Market street is proof of that already. EMR now understand. But vehicle pass through, I don't see how that's gonna help child safety issues.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Egress (have trouble trying to get out of neighborhood. Already backing up around corner. If we opened it up to vehicle traffic, all the people trying to bypass other traffic, we won't be able to get out. Bottleneck
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Interrupts CKC: would create another intersection of CKC.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Creates industrial businesses (PARMAC). Have had to contact three times the police b/c of kids playing in parking lots of parmac.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	BENEFITS (group doesn't see benefits) of 111 <sup>th</sup> all purpose connection:
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Would be taking congestion from one part of city and putting it in another part of city.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	I don't think putting traffic in neighborhood is any answer.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Gridlock would prevent fire response from timely response.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Infrastructure of 111 <sup>th</sup> Avenue isn't built to what you need to handle all the traffic.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Benefits to the city? What's the timeline on benefits to the city?

T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	When did policy change to requiring response from two fire stations. No requirement. Our goal, we have a four minute drive time goal 90 percent of time. Achieve that goal by building fire stations or improving connections. We need to build building redundancy in this area. We need the second due. That's the impetus for the 111th Ave fire access road, and all roads. Need to build redundancy.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	What would cost less? Build bridge across wetlands or set up fire station in middle of highlands.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	What's response time from Houghton Fire Station. Close to four minutes.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Wants to create a fluid transport system for fire department where firefighters can get anywhere at any time. Fire department prefers to travel along arterials b/c they're faster.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Station 21 and 22 are within 5 minutes, so we are almost there. And 26, as well.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	All designed to create very fluid system where we can go anywhere in the city quickly.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Fire stations out of date. How does that jive with what we are talking about here.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	City in planning process to run public safety bond measure in 2021, which will address fire department. Station 27
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Station 24 (new) will take half of Statoin 27's calls. Second part is removing other unit to east side of 405 by hospital on 132 <sup>nd</sup> Ave. Also upgrade existing fire stations for seismic.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Integrate publica safety bond measure into this map (2021)
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	The term redevelopment needs clarification.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Redevelopment is triggered by short plat or subdivision. The process of creating new property lines. Subdivision is anything more than 9 lots. Short plat is 9 lots or less. Tearing down an old house and building a new one triggers frontage improvements. Addition, not remodel, zoning code says we take value of improvement as defined by building code. Value of improvement considers basic elements of improvement. If it's \$262,000, you trigger frontage improvements. NRH in 2000: dirt roads and no sidewalks. Everything out there today is because of code. People say: "This makes no sense why put little bit of sidewalk in middle of nowhere?" But that's pretty much how NRH was built."
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	How do you build a road one section at a time? Showing examples of roads built piece by piece.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	We are not opposed to emergency access only, but we are adamantly opposed to vehicular access. Agreed to by all nine.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Petitions/surveys not brought up yet. People wanted to be here, but not here.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Attended by nine residents of Highlands.
T16	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Build small fire station at city's maintenance center to respond to schools.
T16	Email	18-May-19	In regards to: "Highlands impact: Note that the 111th Ave NE connection to Forbes Creek Drive is back on the table as an emergency vehicle route." As a highlands resident since 1989, I am seriously against this idea. This would be a significant negative impact on the traffic flow and safety within our quiet neighborhood. Please do not let this happen.
T16	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	Please do not build a connection at T16. This will open up more traffic from commuters on 405 and Market to this residential neighborhood where kids walk to school and play.
T16	Online Comment	13-Aug-19	Adding traffic access at the north end of the highlands will provide an alternate path for commuter traffic at the cost of a key intrinsic neighborhood value - low and safe traffic throughout the neighborhood. To address concerns for emergency vehicle access, add an emergency road similar to the bridge over 405 at 100th.
T10	Online Comment	20-Oct-19	Hi - I am writing here to express our opposition to this connection street. 91st street already doesn't have even sidewalks. Now on top of that, this connection will significantly increase traffic and put the pedestrians, especially the kids in danger. I highly recommend to not build this connection and these concerns be taken into account. DO NOT connect NE 91st Street between 130th Ave NE and 132nd Ave NE.
T10	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	This would significantly increase traffic in our quiet neighborhood, flood our street with traffic from The City Church/Church Home parking lot on Sundays and weekdays, provide a cut-through for traffic trying to avoid congested NE 85th Street, and significantly increases the risks of those walking or biking to school or other places in the area. This would NOT provide safer routes for walkers or bikers, it does just the opposite, increasing risks. The proposed T08 connection of NE 90th Street from 132nd Ave NE and 128th Ave NE is a more logical connection. NE 90th Street would then connect from 132nd Ave NE to 120th Ave NE, providing a longer alternate route for traffic.
T10	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	Please DO NOT put a through street on 91st. This would not be good for our neighborhood. We do not want people coming through our neighborhood to get to Churchhome or to cut through traffic on 132. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!
T10	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	1. No road from the east end of NE 91st Street connecting to The City Church or Church Home property and 132nd Ave NE. 2. No road from the east end of NE 91st Street connecting to NE 90th Street. Please protect our neighborhood from Church traffic. The Church has access from 132nd Ave NE and a driveway between NE 91st Street and NE 90th Street.
T10	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	As a resident of North Rose Hill, I am very opposed to connection T10, which proposes to connect 132nd Ave and NE 91st street. This proposed connection has no planned date, but is noted as something that will happen if the property owner (In this case The City Church) initiates development of it's property. Connecting 132nd Ave and NE 91st street would increase traffic in the North Rose Hill residential neighborhood for the sole benefit of The City Church, a local business. The City Church already draws unreasonably large crowds every weekend and holiday, with church attendees crowding our streets and with pedestrians, shuttles, and parked vehicles. It's expansion and subsequent connection of 132nd would quickly and unfairly encroach on quiet residential neighborhoods where families and children do not wish to see an increase in business traffic.

T10	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>Adding a road connection on 91st Street from 128th Ave to 132nd Ave is not good for our neighborhood. There is no benefit to the neighborhood to add a new road connection to the church parking lot from 91st St.</p> <p>There is already an existing road connection from 128th Ave to 132nd Ave via 95th St - 4 blocks from 91st Street. There is no need for another road connection at 91st St from 128th and 132nd.</p> <p>The Churchome parking should not be a consideration for road changes that are not improvements to the community. A change that diverts traffic to neighborhood side streets is not a good plan. Churchome parking and exit should use a main thoroughfare such as 132nd Ave.</p> <p>If there are extra city funds to be spent, the City of Kirkland could add more side walks and street lights in the neighborhood for public safety.</p> <p>Road improvements should occur to improve a neighborhood - safety or maintenance. The proposed road change is NOT in the neighborhood's benefit!! Please cancel the proposed road change on 91st Street.</p>
T10	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>This proposed street connection would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood, not only the walk-ability of the neighborhood, but would increase noise and traffic. This would only benefit the Churchome staff and attendees, most of whom are NOT local neighbors, do not pay KIRKLAND taxes or participate in neighborhood betterment activities. Please do not ruin our quiet, walkable, lovely neighborhood with this recommendation.</p>
T10	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	<p>T10 (along with T07) converts 91st ST from a cul-de-sac to a through street, completely changing the nature of this quite neighborhood street. Commuters will use it as a short cut to and from 405 and traffic will increase significantly. There are no sidewalks which will make use of the street dangerous for pedestrians. Currently, several young children live on 91st ST whose way to school would be compromised. In addition, church traffic will transform 91st ST into a parking lot with bumper to bumper during Sunday church discharge. Overall, we wish you'd make plans for less traffic, not more. Please consider more traffic calming elements for our neighborhood</p>
T10	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	<p>T10 would make our neighborhood more dangerous due to an increase in traffic. I anticipate people cutting through our neighborhood to avoid traffic on 132nd and 85th. Please DO NOT put a through street on 91st. This would not be good for our neighborhood.</p>
T10	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>My kids walk along the paths and streets adjacent to the proposed connection. This connection would add a lot more traffic and make their walking to school less safe.</p>
T09	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>This proposed street connection would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood, not only the walk-ability of the neighborhood, but would increase noise and traffic. This would only benefit the Churchome staff and attendees, most of whom are NOT local neighbors, do not pay KIRKLAND taxes or participate in neighborhood betterment activities. Please do not ruin our quiet, walkable, lovely neighborhood with this recommendation.</p>
T08	Online Comment	24-Oct-19	<p>Turning T08 into a street connection would allow people in the neighborhood to avoid 85th traffic to access 405.</p>
T08	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	<p>I am pleased to see the city agrees that connecting T08 would improve flow and reduce frustrations near the City Church. I do believe it will ease the impact from church traffic on the weekends, but more significantly, it will reduce the amount of time it takes immediate area neighbors to get to the freeway and Hwy 908 during and after construction of the large multifunction apartment complex being built on 85th at NE 132nd. At present, the City Church chains off their driveway and parking lot to through traffic, which is a pain point during extreme congestion as there is no way around bumper to bumper delays. If that road can be connected, while preserving as many tall trees as possible, that would be ideal.</p> <p>I would suggest T07 be formally completed as a walking path, as many children walk through that area to get to and from Twain Elementary school. Opening that tiny section to car traffic would not make it safer for those kids and it would require removing a lot of older, taller, evergreen trees that are a big part of the natural character of this little neighborhood.</p>
T08	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	<p>Connecting T08 will make it faster to get around traffic and congestion at 132nd and 85th at rush hour and when church is getting out.</p>
T08	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>Please DO NOT put a through street on NE 90th Street. This would not be good for our neighborhood. We do not want people coming through our neighborhood to get to Churchome. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!</p>
T08	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>This proposed street connection would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood, not only the walk-ability of the neighborhood, but would increase noise and traffic. This would only benefit the Churchome staff and attendees, most of whom are NOT local neighbors, do not pay KIRKLAND taxes or participate in neighborhood betterment activities. Please do not ruin our quiet, walkable, lovely neighborhood with this recommendation.</p>
T08	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>This connection will increase traffic in an already over busy residential area, and make my children's walking routes to school less safe.</p>
T07, T08, T10	Public Hearing comment 1	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
T07, T08, T10	Public Hearing comment 2	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
T07, T08, T10	Public Hearing comment 3	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
T07, T08, T10	Public Hearing comment 4	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>

T07, T08, T10	Email	31-Oct-19	<p>Hi! I attended the Planning Commissioners Hearing last Thursday (10/24) to provide my thoughts on the potential road changes in the North Rose Hill neighborhood – T7 through T10. As you could tell in the meeting, there are several concerned neighbors that felt left out from Kirkland City Planning process – specifically T7 through T10. The information on the potential road projects didn't flow down to the home owners in my neighborhood. We were shocked at the potential road projects in my neighborhood, and are concerned that these projects adversely affect the neighborhood. We feel like we missed out on the initial discussions regarding these road projects.</p> <p>We are grateful to have the opportunity to voice our concerns in the hearing. The hearing was a one-way dialog (with respect to specific projects) where the Kirkland citizens voiced their thoughts both positive and negative -meaning this was not a meeting to have a two-way dialog regarding one or a set of potential road projects in a specific neighborhood. I liked both of your comments at the end of the hearing. You both seemed open to our thoughts and also provided your thoughts to the process on these potential road changes.</p> <p>There must be a way for me and my neighbors to ask questions and get more information on the specific road projects that are under consideration in the North Rose Hill neighborhood. Can we arrange a meeting with you and the City Planner that is responsible for the North Rose Hill neighborhood? There are several neighbors that will attend to get more information. Let's arrange a meeting at Kirkland City Hall in the next several weeks. Please let me know your thoughts, and I will pass this information to my neighbors.</p> <p>I walked the paths were these potential road projects (T7 through T10), and there is no obvious benefit to the neighbors in this area. There is already two road exits out the back of the church parking lot— one is used and one is locked and not used. There is a new development of homes adjacent to the church, that added a bunch of homes. The road in this new development was just put in, and it dead ends on 128th. This was done so that cars don't cut through their new neighborhood from 132nd to 128th on 90th Street. Why would adding traffic on 91st Street be a good idea? There is no advantage to homes on 91st Street or 130th Avenue – especially when this additional traffic is not for the homes on 91st Street, but instead is coming from the church, new development, or cars trying to cut through the neighborhoods to avoid traffic congestion. There are no new homes added to 91st Street. These road projects don't make sense to the people directly living in this area. The City of Kirkland should require the home developer or church to address the traffic flow within their development – meaning if they need a connection to 128th, then they have to do so within their development instead of blocking off their street at 128th. Do you agree?</p> <p>Some of the information we are looking for:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) Who submitted the proposed road improvements (T7 through T10) – organization, business, city, or private person?</li> <li>2) What is the perceived benefit for these road improvements?</li> <li>3) What is the process that the Planning Commission will use in evaluating these road projects, and is there another opportunity for the home owners to participate in this review/approval process?</li> </ol> <p>In the future, I propose that the City of Kirkland provide flyers in the impacted neighborhoods with the road project details. The approach used for these road projects was not effective – meaning the City of Kirkland connected with home associations but not individual homes that are directly impacted. The information did not flow down in my case – as well as many other neighborhoods based on the input we heard in the hearing. A mailing of city-wide map with road projects was not effective – meaning a single page map was difficult to understand and identify whether a neighborhood is impacted. Also, the rationale of why the road project is being considered is missing.</p> <p>Please let me know your thoughts.</p>
T07	Email	15-Oct-19	<p>Please, please don't do this. The giant firs in my front yard need the wind protection of the trees along the path to protect them from the prevailing winds. In a windstorm up to three could land on our house!</p> <p>Also, people who live on 88th ST and 87th ST may have chosen to buy their houses because of the cul-de-sac locations. I know we did.</p> <p>As well, both Mike Hoxie at 13003 NE 88th ST and Gene Robb at 13004 NE 88th ST are disabled; Mike is in a wheelchair with CP and Gene is expected to be soon, with Parkinsons. A 5- and a 1-year-old live in the house next to Hoxies, riding their bikes/trikes (supervised) in the street.</p> <p>I've shaken in my shoes to speak in public about my objections to this change. So has my husband, my niece and her husband.</p> <p>Again, please reconsider!</p> <p><u>Thank you for your consideration.</u></p>
T07	Online Comment	20-Oct-19	<p>Hi - I am writing here to express our opposition to this connection. 91st street already doesn't have even sidewalks. Now on top of that, this connection will significantly increase traffic and put the pedestrians, especially the kids in danger. I highly recommend to not build this connection and these concerns be taken into account.</p>
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	<p>The road project on 131st Ave is not an improvement to the neighborhood. Currently, this part of the neighbor is pedestrian friendly- as it has been for the last 30 years. This change would allow more cars to cut through the neighborhood to avoid traffic congestion on 132nd and 124th. We should be looking at road improvements that increase pedestrian safety and not divert traffic through the neighborhood. This road connection is NO benefit to the neighborhood. Also, this road is designed for limited traffic for the few houses on this street and the adjacent lane.</p> <p>Also, kids in the neighborhood walk to school on that street. It is important to maintain a pedestrian friendly path to Mark Twain Elementary School and NOT divert traffic to these side streets.</p> <p>Rather than spending City money on projects that don't add much benefit, it would be better to have City road projects work towards long term plans such as rapid transit and light rail.</p> <p>Please cancel this proposed road project! Please let the Rose Hill neighborhood know when these road projects will be presented for approval - mail flyer. I would like to attend and share my thoughts. And, my neighbors will attend too!</p>

T07	Online Comment	17-Oct-19	I am concerned about the T07 street connection because it will remove trees which are being removed at an alarming rate in North Rose Hill with all of the development. More importantly is the safety risk to kids at the T07 segment at the NE 130th dead end because it is thoroughfare for kids walking and riding bikes to Mark Twain elementary school. Lastly, with the overload of traffic on the NE 85th corridor people are already speeding through the neighborhood on 128th (including Mark Twain school zone) to circumvent traffic on 85th, 132nd and 124th. Opening the T7 route (all segments) will inevitable exacerbate this problem and increase safety risk to kids in the area by creating another "shortcut" along 130th. While I understand the need for emergency access if development occurred, I didn't see T7 marked on the map with that code. As a result, I see no benefit from the T7 project marked for private development. Looking forward to sharing my prospective at the 10/24 public comment meeting.
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	This proposed street connection would have detrimental effects to our neighborhood, not only the walk-ability of the neighborhood, but would increase noise and traffic. This would only benefit the Churchome staff and attendees, most of whom are NOT local neighbors, do not pay KIRKLAND taxes or participate in neighborhood betterment activities. Please do not ruin our quiet, walkable, lovely neighborhood with this recommendation.
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	I'm very concerned about the flood of vehicular traffic out of the Churchome parking lot onto the very small residential neighborhood on 130th and 94th st.  As a resident of 94th st, when the church opens the back gate currently, we already receive a bunch of vehicles speeding out of the gate, and up to our cul-de-sac after church gets out looking for a short-cut to bypass the traffic.  Additionally, there is not enough room for 2 way traffic on the street when cars park on both sides of this residential neighborhood so that they can access the church.  This is a lose-lose for the residents of the neighborhood surrounding Churchome.
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	Please do not approve this private development project proposed by the church. It will ruin the neighborhood and quiet space that is hard to find. There is ample access to the church already
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	No street connection from the north end of 130th Ave NE to 94th Ave NE. This would connect the northwest parking area of City Church or Church Home to our neighborhood. This church has access to their parking from 132nd Ave NE and a driveway off of 128th Ave NE between NE 91st Street and NE 90th Street. Please protect our neighborhood from this church traffic and overflow parking.
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	As a resident on 130th Ave NE, I am VERY opposed to connection T07. This connection will dramatically increase traffic and in our neighborhood for the sole benefit of The City Church. The City Church already draws very large crowds and considerable traffic every weekend and holiday, with attendees constantly parking in residential neighborhoods. Enabling this connection will only result in its increase. We and our neighbors bought homes on quiet streets in a residential neighborhood. The City Church is a business. It's expansion should NOT come at the expense of the surrounding neighborhood. Connecting 130 Ave NE at T07 will make it yet another major artery through North Rose Hill where none is needed, strictly for the benefit of a local business that is already resulting in unreasonable weekend crowds.
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	Please DO NOT put a through street on 130th. This would not be good for our neighborhood. We do not want people coming through our neighborhood to get to Churchome. These are places that people walk their kids to school at Mark Twain. PLEASE DO NOT ALLOW THIS TO HAPPEN!
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	DO NOT connect 130th Ave NE from NE 87th Street to NE 94th Street. This would significantly increase traffic from The City Church/Church Home (the church) parking lot on Sundays AND weekdays, increase the risks of walkers and bikers to local schools and other locations. We chose to live in this quiet dead-end street neighborhood to provide safety for us and our children and avoid extra traffic. These connections provide more access for church traffic and cut through traffic. The church has adequate access to their parking lot along a large area of 132nd Ave NE and has a driveway access to their parking lot off of 128th Ave NE between NE 90th Street and NE 91st Street. This driveway was granted to be used as exit from the church on Sundays only. But, it is open all the time (the chain gate is never closed), and cars frequently go up and down this driveway all days of the week. This church traffic, and traffic from people cutting through church property to go from 132nd Ave NE to 128th Ave NE, is impacting our neighborhood environment and safety. The proposed connection would only make our neighborhood more at risk for walkers and bikers.
T07	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	I firmly object to this proposed connection because it would remove mature trees, convert a quiet dead end street that neighborhood uses for kids to play and walk to school, and create a traffic thoroughfare that is clearly intended to benefit a church that is backed by City of Kirkland. In essence, this proposal further degrades the quality of the neighborhood that we moved to 15years ago
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	This is a horrible idea that compromises the peaceful community full of children that play outside! Residents in the area purchased houses on dead-end and cul-de-sac streets intentionally and this proposal wants to destroy that. NOOOOOOO!
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	#T07 would be terrible for our street NE 88th to 132nd Ave NE. We have NO Sidewalks. As more houses have been built down the hills we have much more traffic on 88th to 132nd. As I walk to the bus or just take my dog for a walk, I am in fear of fast traveling cars while I am walking on the street because there are no sidewalks. Children are even more at risk.
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	The existing walking path is safer for walking or riding bikes to school than putting in connecting streets. My kids walk on this all the time. Connecting streets will increase traffic through an already over busy residential area, and make them less safe. Particularly with the density being added to 85th, adding more connections here seems likely to increasing traffic and lower safety.
T07	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	This would make my street much busier, and less safe for kids. Right now our street is calm and quiet. If T07 goes in then my street will become very busy.

T07	Email	15-Oct-19	<p>I received a post card from the City with a web address that didn't work. <a href="http://bit.ly/kirklandcitywideconnections">http://bit.ly/kirklandcitywideconnections</a></p> <p>Today I finally tracked down access to your DRAFT Citywide Transportation Connections Map v.1.5 - Staff Recommendations and found out that a rumor I heard was true. That the City wants to pave a lovely walk path from NE 87th thru to NE 88th street so you can funnel all the car traffic from a new apt complex on the corner of 85th and 132nd to our street. (Car access from the apt complex will be to 131st Ave NE to NE 87th.) This is very distressing.</p> <p>We already have a lot of traffic speeding by. We have no sidewalks on NE 88th street.</p> <p>In the last 10 years many many houses have been built at the ends of the street which has substantially increased traffic on our NE 88th street to 132nd Ave NE where the traffic is bumper to bumper, morning, evening and on Sundays.</p> <p>Yes, I see that you "expect" cars to go straight through to 130th and turn left onto 90th to go to 128th, but, trust me, a lot of the cars will turn right onto NE 88th street. This will be very very dangerous for pedestrians.</p> <p>Plus at that corner of 88th and 130th we would need a 4 way stop because it is so narrow and cars coming up the hill on 88th can't see.</p> <p>I am very sad that to say I don't believe you will care for our problems and will do T07 anyway. But if you DO DO T07, you MUST put in sidewalks so we can safely walk next to this new "freeway" on NE 88th for the new apt complex around the corner.</p>
T07	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	T07 would make pedestrian paths into roads. I am strongly opposed to this happening. Children use these paths daily to get to and from Mark Twain elementary school. I am concerned about the impact of the increased traffic on the safety of the children in our neighborhood.
T06	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Does this connection end at 5th Place S? The line shows it crossing the CKC and ending at 6th Street Kids walk in the middle of the street to get to this corner.
T06	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Great idea
T05	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Good idea; Drivers speed around this corner and kids walk in the middle of the street to get to this corner.
T04	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
T04	Email from SRHBT Board	14-Jun-19	Makes no sense as a street connection, since this is a key link in the new Greenway project. Our neighborhood successfully worked with the city to delete this street connection proposal as part of The Preserve development just a few years ago. The existing pedestrian (bike) connection works fine and reduces vehicle traffic on NE 75 <sup>th</sup> St.
T04	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Need to preserve integrity of greenways as walk/bike route with minimal car traffic. If T04 is built as one way, need another diverter and another block east of here in the other direction. Fire bollard. Would be great to have walk/bike connection on 75th Street between 130th and 132nd (at LW Methodist Church connection to Rose Hill Middle School).
T04	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	T04- interested in the criteria, changed or stricken. How connecting ne 74 <sup>th</sup> street between the ending area would be safer for walking, biking, bus use than it currently is. How a currently closed area, with a historic tree would be safer by putting a road through there. Doesn't understand what the importance of completing a grid is? Is a map more important than other things? There are already 2 ways out, do we need three? Have sent a letter to the city.
T04	Email from SRHBT Board	19-Aug-19	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The greenway project on NE 75th St should be as free from vehicle traffic as possible. Opening this connection, with no stops east-west along NE 75th St will become a new cut-through route for commuter traffic, along with higher speeds.</li> <li>- This connection is not needed for improved vehicle and emergency vehicle connection. We specifically argued, successfully, to have the Preserve complete the connection to NE 80th St as an alternative.</li> <li>- The current connection already provides a convenient school connection for walking and biking. It would not provide a transit route option, since there is no bus service except for Kindergarten.</li> <li>- The redevelopment of 7508 126th St NE should not necessitate completing the street due to the 'city's overarching development polices (your email)'. We interpret this as bureaucratic-speak that is beholden to a rigid policy that does not account for context of the neighborhood and the actual need for a particular action. If the 7508 126th St NE property redevelops, we see no neighborhood access or public safety benefits of creating a vehicle connection that would offset the negative impacts to the Greenway and neighborhood traffic movements. Specifically, the said property vehicle access would also not improve. The 'overarching policies' should be those that benefit the city and the affected neighborhoods.</li> <li>- The tree and granite glacial erratic in the ROW may have historical significance that should not be ignored.</li> <li>- Informal polling of adjacent neighbors during the Preserve process indicated no support for this vehicular connection.</li> </ul> <p>Our neighborhood is happy to work with the city to develop a reasonable connections map and process. But we don't want rigid city policies to come between reasonable common sense and the strong interests of our neighborhood.</p>

T04	Email from SRHBT Board	23-Oct-19	<p>The South Rose Hill Bridle Trails Neighborhood board has the following comments regarding the 2019 Proposed Connections Proposals. Please enter these comments into the public hearing record on 10/24/19.</p> <p>We continue to strongly object to Project 104 being retained as a vehicle connection for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-This is a key link in the new Greenway projects on both NE 75th St and 128th Ave NE. If the city is committed to promoting active transportation as an option to driving within neighborhoods, this is a prime opportunity to put those words to action. The existing pedestrian (bike) connection works fine and reduces vehicle traffic on NE 75th St.</li> <li>-A vehicular street connection provides no benefits- there is a good street grid network already in the neighborhood, and there are no traffic benefits to be achieved by making this a street connection. Our neighborhood successfully worked with the city to delete this street connection proposal as part of The Preserve development just a few years ago. That development, with 35 single family residences, could not make the case to build this connection. Why could future redevelopment of the connection-adjacent property at 7508 126th Ave NE (maximum 2-3 houses) make a stronger case for a street connection?</li> <li>-The large healthy legacy tree and glacier erratic boulder adjacent to the existing nonmotorized connection are community and environmental assets that cannot be summarily dismissed in this discussion, especially in the context of the city claiming to make better tree preservation requirements as part of Code 95 revisions.</li> </ul> <p>The staff report cites Policy T-5.6 (Create a system of streets and trails that form an interconnected network) as the overriding reason by staff to support making this vehicular street connection, more important than T-2.3 (Build a Network of Greenways). We are astonished that the city would choose to prioritize a vehicular connection on a newly established Greenway, versus making a strong policy statement that the city is committed to active transportation links and will only consider vehicular connections when absolutely needed. We are also extremely disappointed that the city has dismissed our neighborhood association's very strong objections to this vehicular connection for the reasons cited above.</p> <p>We have previously commented to the Planning Commission, staff, and Council on this topic, and we request that Project 104 be modified to indicate that only a nonmotorized connection will be permitted with future development.</p>
T02 & T03	Email from SRHBT Board	14-Jun-19	Are proposed to occur only when new development occurs. These types of connections should be shown separately in the plan and on the map, since the city would not actively be looking to develop these facilities absent development.
T02	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	I question the viability and need for a connection behind Bridle Trails center parallel to apartments and water tank with a bank elevation of more than 10 feet difference.
T01-T04	Email from SRHBT Board	14-Jun-19	We strongly advise that any of the streets that fall into the 'Street Required by Code' category be shown separately with the specific notation that they would only be considered in response to a development proposal. Since the city has no plans to actively develop these streets absent development, including them on equal footing in this proposal will be very misleading to residents and likely create unnecessary community opposition.
T01-T04	Email from SRHBT Board	14-Jun-19	We see no justification to include any of the proposed street connections. These were not discussed in the recently completed neighborhood plan and provide minimal additional connectivity.
T01 & T02	Email from SRHBT Board	14-Jun-19	Are partially justified by Concurrency. There is nothing in the city's concurrency program that identifies these connections, and they are not needed to meet concurrency requirements. Please check whether Project T01 is actually public right-of-way. This goes right through a very mature forest with minimal need for a connection, much less a street connection.
T01	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Why spend money to go through a virgin forest that has been there since 1920s and 1930s.
T New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Connect NE 138th Place to 100th Avenue NE
P56.3	Online Comment	29-Oct-19	I served on the Highwoodlands Board for 19 years. In that time we had numerous break-ins in our pool house and our pool and damage to our playground equipment. This is a private park. Further exposure to the private pool, pool house and our brand new playground equipment is troublesome. This park is maintained by Home Owner Dues and is private for our members only. Please reconsider this disruption to our privacy. Thank you.
P56.3	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	For a City that chronically claims it cannot afford improvements on neighborhood streets to reduce speeding cars, this project makes no economic sense. An overpass over I 405 is extremely expensive. Why would you build one here when a similar overpass is proposed at NE 140th St, just 1/4 mile to the south. (p28). Moreover, the east end of P56.1 ends in the middle of a private park. There is already substantial objection to running the P56 Connection through that park. The overpass at NE 140 provides much more accessibility to the public by directly connecting NE 140th on both sides of 405. Do what makes economic sense here. [staff note: comment originally associated with P56.1 by commenter; upon reading the description, staff assumed constituent intended to comment on P56.3]
P56, P56.3	Letter	21-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P56 and P56.3</a>
P56	Online Comment	16-Nov-19	Please keep the public access away from our High Woodlands Private HOA Property at NE 148th Ct.
P56	Online Comment	16-Nov-19	I am curious if there is any more information of the scope of the P56 and P56.3 proposed pedestrian connections. How will this public path connect to NE 140th st, are there plans to update the paths within kingsgate park (there is a section that is very steep and has bad footing). Will this project be adding lighting to this path? The current trail is nice, but becomes dangerous to walk on when dark. (Feel free to contact me at ).
P56	OurKirkland - Contact City Council	14-Nov-19	As a High woodlands residents since 1988 I OPPOSE THIS PUBLIC TRAIL to be built on our private land-and in our back yards you are inviting strangers to walk basically in our back yards opening up problems of petty crimes or larger and transient behavior making what is now a safe area to an UNSAFE AREA/ OPPOSE THIS 100% !!! NO NO NO
P56	OurKirkland - Contact City Council	14-Nov-19	I am vehemently against allowing any part of this trail to pass through private HighWoodlands Park property. I have been a resident of HighWoodlands for over 40 years and have seen our park improved and expanded to service our private residents. No public access should be allowed.

P56	OurKirkland - Contact City Council	15-Nov-19	Dear City Council - As residents of the High Woodlands Neighborhood we are hopeful that staff recommendations to NOT extend the new proposed P56 trail north beyond where it will go under I-405 will be heeded. We are very concerned about a public access trail and associated problems with petty crime, transients, etc. In addition, as homeowners we have paid dues for years to maintain our private park, pool and tennis courts and we just invested a large sum into new playground equipment which is for our members' use, not the general public. Please also consider that we are also concerned about a path coming from the Kingsgate Park to the South and from the I-405 underpass to the west. Both corridors would funnel the public right through our private park without any wall or fencing.
P56	OurKirkland - Contact City Council	14-Nov-19	I am vehemently against allowing any part of this trail to pass through private HighWoodlands Park property. I have been a resident of HighWoodlands for over 40 years and have seen our park improved and expanded to service our private residents. No public access should be allowed.
P56	Online Comment	29-Oct-19	This proposed public trail would go through private property and through common areas that are privately owned by local HOAs, and would therefore seem to offer the use of these common areas to anyone passing through, and facilitate inappropriate use of these locations by illegal campers, etc. Such application should be limited to use of public property, with appropriate means to minimize the risk of trespassing by passers-by.
P56	Public Hearing comment 1	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
P56	Public Hearing comment 2	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
P56	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	I'm not interested in strangers having a "backdoor" access to our neighborhood community via this proposed path. From Juanita Creek north to the end of this connection at NE 150th St, it runs directly through a private park owned by the High Woodlands Homeowners Association. We already have enough problems with vandalism and transients without giving the general public even better access. The Association has invested heavily in its playground, tennis court, and swimming pool is property. The Police Dept is already stretched thin to provide minimal patrols of this land which will become de facto a public park with a public path going directly through it. Providing this open access to a park that homeowners pay to use is unfair to them. We have recently spent \$50,000 for new playground equipment. By sitting next to a public trail it naturally becomes public, even if signage indicates it is private. The Association would incur additional expenses stemming from more use, vandalism, and liability. I am not sure if planners are aware that this expands of land is private property. I strongly object to the City's plan to run a public trail directly through a private park.
P56	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	This trail has the potential to bring significant numbers of people directly into our neighborhood park, with the associated potential for more petty crime and transients. Our homeowner association has just invested heavily in new playground equipment in our park for our members' use, not for public trail users. What about using the Tolt-Pipeline to connect across 405? Connect the Tolt-Pipeline across 405 by the Brickyard Park and Ride.
P56	Online Comment	19-Oct-19	I reject the proposed pedestrian path from Kingsgate to High Woodlands because the path leads directly to our privately funded and maintained park and facilities. The additional pedestrian traffic will overburden our private park and facilities by non-home owner pedestrians and vehicle parking at the "trail head". I vote no on this proposal  There is no reason to open private property access to existing trails which have been privately maintained. Trails do not need to breach privately held property. This proposed trail is hidden and very difficult to police. Public parks are where trail heads and destinations should be developed.
P56	Online Comment	11-Oct-19	This map raises issues with the north end of this proposed pedestrian connection. The North half of this line runs through private property not public land. The land is owned by our Homeowners Association and we would not be in support of opening this up and increasing traffic to and through our property. Please re-consider this and remove this from the map.
P56	Online Comment	18-Oct-19	The norther half of this pedestrian path (north of P56.3) is actually on private property (172605TRCT). Even excluding the northern portion, this path (and street connection P56.3) would be immediately adjacent to our private woodland park (162605TRCT). We have had problems with trespassing and camping on our property and I am very concerned this increased public access would lead to increased trespassing on our property. I appreciate the city's efforts to add these kind of paths, but I oppose P56.
P56	Online Comment	19-Oct-19	I live in this neighborhood and am not in favor of pedestrian connection #P56. The pedestrian path would cut right through our private park for which we pay dues for and have currently invested a lot of money adding new playground equipment for the use by those living in our neighborhood.
P56	Online Comment	20-Oct-19	This trail runs through and next to our neighborhood's private oroerty. It has the potential to bring significant numbers of people directly into our private park, with the associated potential for more petty crime and transients which has already become an increasingly problematic issue that we have worked with the city on. In addition, we have just invested heavily in new playground equipment in our park for our members' use, not for public trail users passing right by it. Please do NOT build public paths in this location. Thank you.
P55	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	How will this connection interact with the new I405 interchange?
P53.1	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	I support an eventual connection between the 129th Street cul-de-sac and 94th Ave. , this is not the place to put a connection. The slope is very, very steep and there are a number of better options for creating a connection. I'd like to talk to my neighbors about it first
P53.1	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	I support an eventual connection between the 129th Street cul-de-sac and 94th Ave. , this is not the place to put a connection. The slope is very, very steep and there are a number of better options for creating a connection.
P53.1	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	You are NOT putting a public path thru the middle of my backyard and down my driveway. It won't happen. There's no immanent domain to be had in the middle of my property. Dream on. We've already had to install security due to the homeless camps. No way to a path. No way in hell.  Find somewhere else to stick your path. Not in my backyard.

P53.1	Online Comment	16-Oct-19	<p>1. Privacy and Security – The potential project lies between 5’ and 50’ and at a higher elevation than our home, giving persons of ill will ready access to vandalism, voyeurism and theft. Due to the elevated topography and the need to clear vegetation for the potential project, tall fences or other visual screen will need to be constructed.</p> <p>2. Slope Stability - The potential project lies within or adjacent to highly and moderately susceptible areas to landslide as mapped by the City of Kirkland (2019CityLandslideMap). Significant construction consideration must be given to prevent property damage from landslides.</p> <p>3. Topography –The existing slope of the potential project ranges from about 11%, 22% and 30%. Significant construction consideration must be given to safely provide a pathway down this uneven slope.</p> <p>4. Stormwater and Erosion Damage to our Property – The average grade of this potential project is about 25% downslope from 94th Ave NE toward NE 129th Pl. Significant construction consideration must be given to prevent property damage to our down gradient property from stormwater runoff and erosion.</p> <p>5. Equal Accessibility - The average grade of this potential project is about 25% downslope from 94th Ave NE toward NE 129th PL. Significant construction consideration must be given to safely provide equal access to those with disabilities (ADA compliant), including individuals with: wheelchairs, walkers, visually impaired, etc. and others including those: pushing baby strollers, small children with bicycles, etc.</p> <p>6. Slip, Trip and Fall Hazard (Moss, Ice and Snow) – The potential project is located on an about 25% slope near the base of a southeast facing hill. The area is mostly shaded during the year. The area is the first to see ice and snow arrive and the last to see it melt away. Moss grows quickly and readily. Significant construction considerations and frequent maintenance will be required to mitigate these moss, ice and snow hazards.</p> <p>7. Attractive Nuisance Hazard – This path would be over 160 feet long with an average slope of about 25% with about ¼ mile of additional runoff extending downgrade at about 3% - 5% on NE 129th PL. Construction consideration must be given to safely deter snow sleds, street luge, bicycle jumpers, skateboarders and the like from this temptation.</p> <p>8. Maintenance – Moss, ice, snow, sand and gravel, noxious weeds, litter, waste sharps (hypodermic needles) and dog feces are routinely found along the 94th AVE NE roadside and vicinity. Construction provisions and frequent maintenance will be required to mitigate the accumulation of biohazards, environmental hazards and other Foreign Object Debris (FOD).</p>
P52	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	<p>Soil instability could be a very expensive problem to overcome in this area. The hill is very steep and vulnerable to saturation from storm drains above. A large slide covered Holmes Point Drive only a few years ago below 136th and 137th. With the parks already close by with great trails all around, it seems beyond silly to consider development of a trail here. A pedestrian walkway along Holmes Point Drive would make much more sense.</p> <p>Walkway alongside Holmes Point Drive from Denny Park to the park trails at the crest near Juanita Drive.</p>
P51, P52	Online Comment	4-Nov-19	<p>P51 and P52 will be difficult to build, but what an asset they would be. Along with P45, they would make for large hiking loops. Please move forward with these options.</p>
P51, P52	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>P51 and 52 don't appear feasible and should not be built. They don't provide a lot of connection value, would have to traverse through steep sensitive slopes, and connect through private property. Don't include these on the map.</p>
P49.2	Online Comment	26-Sep-19	<p>I want to strongly urge you to remove this as a possible street connection at 63rd Avenue NE to connect to NE 129th Street. This path is used on a regular basis by our neighborhoods for pedestrian traffic. It is safe route for children walking to school buses and keeps children from having to walk along busy Holmes Point Road.</p> <p>Secondly, if this became a road it would create motor traffic right in front of established homes and yards, they would all be compromised.</p> <p>Third, there is easy access from the streets on either side of this proposed connection. There is no need to add an additional route.</p>
P49.1, P49.2	Email	25-Nov-19	<p>Thanks for being so thorough and diligent with the connector planning. We live on 64th Ave NE and are especially affected by connection P.49 (63rd Ave to 129th St) and P49.1 (64th Ave to 130th Pl). I commend you that you plan these connection as a pedestrian walkway and a mechanism to open it for emergencies like fire or earthquake. This will certainly help to keep the connection from the 63rd Ave cul de sac safe. A general link there would be a major street hazard. In the afternoon the hazard is even more when the school buses arrive, and lots of students are walking on 129th St. People drive down 129th St and do not carefully check their surroundings. Perhaps a speed bump on 129th could additional improve safety.</p> <p>Regarding the link from the 64th Ave cul de sac to 130th Pl (this is where we live). This open literally a new dimension since currently there is no way to even walk this path. It is an interesting thought, and I welcome the idea to walk to 130th Pl easily.. However, I have at least 2 additional considerations for P49.1 – I do not know if you thought about this:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Loss of trees and canopies: This is against the general wish to increase canopy in Kirkland. Perhaps your design can minimize the loss of trees.</li> <li>-Safety: We have seen crimes (car prowling and burglaries) in our area. When we had our last meeting with police regarding the matter, we got the moderately satisfying response that Holmes Point is about as good or bad as Kirkland as whole. However, even a pedestrian way, especially one that can be potentially used for firetrucks, increases the chance of criminal acts. The perpetrators could park on the side of 130th Pl and have a new avenue to enter our areas. It may need additional surveillance from police on 130th Pl.</li> </ul>
P49.1, P49.2	OurKirkland - Contact City Council	24-Oct-19	<p>Dear Planning Commission,</p> <p>I am unable to attend the public hearing this evening so I'd like to leave my comment via email.</p> <p>This is in regards to the proposed P49.1 and P49.2 connections in the Holmes Point neighborhood.</p> <p>I support that these connections remain pedestrian walkways.</p> <p>I am not convinced of the increased EMS response times that these connections would serve.</p> <p>It would be at the jeopardy of the safety of our children.</p> <p>The 64th Ave NE culdesac is regularly used by children to play and learn to ride bikes.</p> <p>129th St is a walking route for children to and from the bus stop. It is already a hazardous street to walk due to no sidewalks, curves, and traffic.</p> <p>I know a priority for the City is safer routes to school so as to promote walking, biking, bus.</p> <p>Thank you for considering this as you make recommendations to City Council.</p>

P49	Online Comment	20-Nov-19	We live at the end of the cul-de-sac on 129th Pl. Our home backs to a sensitive wooded area abundant with trees, ferns, and wildlife (deer, bobcats, coyotes). The terrain is very steep and aggressive. Furthermore, we had a geotech consultant review the soil conditions of the steep hills directly behind our home and he indicated extreme landslide conditions could develop should any of the natural soil be disturbed. Obviously this is a terrible idea for the City of Kirkland to consider making any sort of a pedestrian walkway in this sensitive habitat. We vehemently oppose this suggestion as it poses a huge threat to not only the natural habitat of this lovely wooded area but also a major threat to the safety of our homesite.
P49	Online Comment	26-Sep-19	This is an excellent pedestrian connection and there should be no further identification of 63rd Ave N.E. as a traffic street connection.
P48	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Good pedestrian connection
P46	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	This doesn't make sense because there is a trail used now by dogs and walkers across from NE 124th Street - connecting the same neighborhoods (only 3 properties away)
P45	Online Comment	4-Nov-19	I have dreamed about such a connection for 15 years. The Susan McDonald area up above connected with O.O. Denny Park! It will be tough to build, but please do move forward with this wonderful, relevant connection between the upper neighborhood and O.O. Denny Park.
P45	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Great - do it
P42	Email	16-Nov-19	<p>Dear Mayor Sweet and Council members,</p> <p>I would like to submit belated comments on three proposed street connections near my home on Champagne Point Road:</p> <p>-P41: This is a proposal for a pedestrian extension of Champagne Point Lane to Holmes Point Drive at a point where Holmes Point Drive curves up and away from the lake and towards the Juanita Woodlands. (Note that the textual description of the proposed connection refers erroneously to an extension of Champagne Point Road). The connection would provide access to Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous location for walkers and, in any event, would not be heavily used by neighbors because it would serve only a few homes on a short cul de sac. No neighbors have submitted comments in support of the proposal. It should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-P42: This is a proposal for pedestrian access from the lower portion of Champagne Point Road up a steep embankment in a high landslide hazard zone to access Holmes Point Drive on the same curve as is described above. No one has submitted comments in support of this proposed pedestrian route. It would be steep, would possibly destabilize the embankment, would probably be expensive to construct, and would access Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous point on the road for walkers (just like P41). This proposal should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-T37: This connection would extend 76th Avenue south along Juanita Woodlands Park to meet 73rd Place and 116th NE Street as they intersect with Holmes Point Drive. While a pedestrian route from this intersection to 76th Avenue might make sense, particularly if additional homes are constructed in the immediate vicinity, the extension of 76th for vehicular traffic would be highly problematic given the lack of sightlines at the intersection with Holmes Point Drive. Also, the proposed extension of 76th would not enhance vehicular connectivity in any meaningful way or abbreviate emergency response times. The record shows that most neighbors do not support a vehicular extension but generally favor only non-motorized access. This connection should be converted to a pedestrian/cycle route.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering these comments.</p>
P41	Email	16-Nov-19	<p>Dear Mayor Sweet and Council members,</p> <p>I would like to submit belated comments on three proposed street connections near my home on Champagne Point Road:</p> <p>-P41: This is a proposal for a pedestrian extension of Champagne Point Lane to Holmes Point Drive at a point where Holmes Point Drive curves up and away from the lake and towards the Juanita Woodlands. (Note that the textual description of the proposed connection refers erroneously to an extension of Champagne Point Road). The connection would provide access to Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous location for walkers and, in any event, would not be heavily used by neighbors because it would serve only a few homes on a short cul de sac. No neighbors have submitted comments in support of the proposal. It should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-P42: This is a proposal for pedestrian access from the lower portion of Champagne Point Road up a steep embankment in a high landslide hazard zone to access Holmes Point Drive on the same curve as is described above. No one has submitted comments in support of this proposed pedestrian route. It would be steep, would possibly destabilize the embankment, would probably be expensive to construct, and would access Holmes Point Drive at a dangerous point on the road for walkers (just like P41). This proposal should be removed from the map.</p> <p>-T37: This connection would extend 76th Avenue south along Juanita Woodlands Park to meet 73rd Place and 116th NE Street as they intersect with Holmes Point Drive. While a pedestrian route from this intersection to 76th Avenue might make sense, particularly if additional homes are constructed in the immediate vicinity, the extension of 76th for vehicular traffic would be highly problematic given the lack of sightlines at the intersection with Holmes Point Drive. Also, the proposed extension of 76th would not enhance vehicular connectivity in any meaningful way or abbreviate emergency response times. The record shows that most neighbors do not support a vehicular extension but generally favor only non-motorized access. This connection should be converted to a pedestrian/cycle route.</p> <p>Thank you very much for considering these comments.</p>
P39	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	This is a much needed connection to enable our children to safely walk or bike to school.

P39	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Why do we need two pedestrian pathways here when we are already going after P37
P37, A39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	P37/A39-Walkway was never open, until a home was built. There is a bus stop. Concerned about garbage, vandals, large numbers of people. It's private property. Narrow corridor, no lights, escape route for burglars.
P37, A39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Q-Has the city contacted the other property owner near P37/A39. Yes the city is making contact.
P37, A39	Email	24-Sep-19	<p>We are writing to let know that our public comments have mysteriously disappeared on the interactive public comment map for the street/pedestrian connections. We are the property owner of the proposed A39 and P37 connections. We have been bullied by the City of Kirkland staff and bullied and threatened by the neighborhood in trying to open this pedestrian pathway. We do not want a pathway in our backyard. Approx 2004 the Northshore Utility District looped the sewer line through what is the proposed P37 pathway. Before that you could not walk through there. After that we had nothing but trouble: People leaving garbage, killing wildlife, turning our dogs into animal control even though they were on our property, and we were burglarized with the robber leaving an ax on our dresser. The King County Sheriff told us it was because they had a perfect escape path with the newly opened pathway. We cleaned up hypodermic needles by the bag full. We had teenagers partying leaving beer cans and smoking. When calling the Kirkland Police to report that we were threatened by people using our property, they did nothing. No one ever called me to follow up. This prgoam will also lower property values for the adjacent to these pathways as found in a 2006 study of the Burke Gillman trail.</p> <p>NARPO studied the Burke-Gilman Trail and property values and refuted claims of a study done by the Seattle Engineering Department. The NARPO study focused on properties next to the trail and showed that property values along the trail corridor had declined or had not risen in value similar to what comparable properties had between 1979 and 1988. Between 1988 and 1997 the abutting, adjacent properties had increased by about 100% but this was not as much as the 140% increase cited for similar properties in the area. NARPO argues that the only reason for differences in figures was due to the presence of the trail. Perhaps this is an example where property values were affected negatively. Figures were based on the assessed value of the land as kept by the assessment office rather than the total value of the property or actual selling prices. (continued in next row)</p>
			<p>(continued from above)</p> <p>P37 is a long, narrow, unlit pathway with no active surveillance. During the Cross Kirkland Corridor study the The Seattle Police Chief the King County Sheriff testified that pathways with no active surveillance can be dangerous. P37 has no active surveillance. We have worked hard for this property and what we have and now you are asking us to give this up and pay to allow the public to use it. This is offensive and the City of Kirkland should be ashamed of itself for trying to claim imminent domain through the back door with this connections program. There is no dire need for P37 other than it is something that is wanted, not needed. This also goes for A39 street connection that would cause more danger to an already dangerous intersection at 80th ave NE and Juanita Drive. The fire department has stated this is not a priority for them.</p> <p>We have recently had a new development built just to the south of us. During this process, the Kirkland City Planning staff told us they could not tell the developer where to put their roads. Yet, the City of Kirkland is now proposing to tell all adjacent property owners to any of the proposed street connection that not only do they have to put these connections where you tell them, but you have to pay for it as well. This is unfair. Should someone want to improve their home, because it is too small, add a bedroom etc... they save the money to do it, and then BAM, now they can't because they have to make public improvements costing tens of thousands of dollars. It is a way of the City taking private property without paying for it.</p> <p>As for our particular neighborhood, those that want these connections should raise the money to improve pedestrian access to Juanita drive. The City has spent thousands of dollars on improving bike access to Juanita drive but has done nothing for pedestrians. Putting a sidewalk on Juanita would be a fairer way to approach this issue than requiring homeowners to give up their property. Would you like to have 200 people traipse through your back yard 4 hours a day? Lights shining in your bedroom? Killing your pets? It has happened on all pathways that have no active surveillance. These things cannot be mitigated. Sometimes the City staff cannot see the forest through the trees in their quest for "walkability". Private property owners have rights too, and they should be respected.</p> <p>We are asking that you eliminate P37 and A39 from this proposal as our property will never be developed.</p>
P37	Email	18-Nov-19	<p>I wanted to write in opposition of pathway P37 for the following reasons:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The walkway is not needed; it is not needed for emergency purposes and it is outside of the walking radius of Sandburg, the closest school.</li> <li>- P37 pathway has no active surveillance and lighting the pathway will cause great disturbance to surrounding homes. Surveillance will impinge on privacy.</li> <li>- It poses a security risk to the neighborhood including burglary, which this pathway has already been used as an escape route for a burglarized home in the neighborhood.</li> <li>- A sidewalk on Juanita drive would allow for access to more foot traffic in a safer location with lights, surveillance and destinations that don't roam aimlessly through neighborhoods.</li> <li>- There is already a planned future connection to 117th street pending the development of the adjacent property and this is a duplicative path.</li> <li>- There are more important projects than this that would provide greater value to the residents of Finn Hill and Kirkland.</li> </ul> <p>Again, I state my opposition to P37 for the above reasons and do not believe that the reasons provided in favor of development outweigh the reasons listed above that oppose it.</p>

P37	Email	18-Nov-19	<p>We moved to Hersoma Vista March 1,1976. At that time the Finn Hill Junior High students,in our area were required to walk to school,walking on Juanita Drive was to dangerous.</p> <p>The kids,including my daughter,used the pathway in question,up 80th to get to school. Our daughter was in 7th grade when we moved here,so the kids used that path to get to school for two years until the school district agreed to bus service in Hersoma Vista.</p> <p>It was to dangerous to walk on Juanita Drive 40 plus years ago and it is even more dangerous today. That pathway has been used for over 40 years. Finn Hill Junior High at that time was 7th,8th,9th grade,so we had several kids use the pathway in question.</p>
P37	Emailed Letter	6-Nov-19	<p>On Oct. 28th, 2019 we received an email from Councilman Pascal stating that they have heard from no one in opposition to this walkway. We found this hard to believe so we set out to knock on doors in the neighborhood. We found the opposite to be true. 90% of the residents we spoke to had no idea that this pathway was proposed and those that did know did not know it had become a capital funds project.</p> <p>Attached is a petition with 22 signatures, including the president of the Chatam Ridge Homeowners association, stating they do not want this walkway open. We have only been able to spend a few hours so far, but we will continue to knock on doors. Everyone we spoke with signed the petition.</p> <p>There are several people in all the neighborhoods around us that do not want this walkway. We also believe this pathway will cost the City tens of thousands of tax payer dollars. Money that could go to more important projects.</p> <p>We were told by Ms. Kari Page that it is the Staff's intent to condemn both my property and the Kogan's property to connect the Artoush path with the Chatam Ridge Tract B. This is an expensive proposition. It does not just entail moving fence lines.</p> <p>Our property contains a drainage ditch that is the outfall for the Chatam Ridge detention tank. To fence off my property would require an engineered culvert to tight-line and ensure the proper outfall from the detention tank.</p> <p>The Kogan;s property has mature landscaping and very large landscape rocks. Contrary to what Ms. Page told us, you cannot trim the trees so that you can walk around them. It would require heavy machinery to re-landscape this area.</p> <p>Chatam Ridge Tract B is currently just grass and brush. It will need to be cleared and a surface will need to be installed to walk on. If not, it will become very muddy. If the surface installed is at all considered partly or fully impervious, it will need storm drainage to ensure that that he water run-off goes into the storm system and treated for water quality, and does not cause damage to our property.</p> <p>Both tract B and the Artoush pathway overly our roadway access easements. These easements cannot be altered in anyway that would restrict, encumber, or infringe upon our access. This means no sidewalks, fencing, bollards, light posts, privacy landscaping, etc... that would do so.</p> <p><del>There will be an ongoing cost to the City for maintenance and clean up of this pathway. Past experience has shown this to be a constant effort as pointed out in precious correspondence.</del></p>
P37	Emailed Letter	6-Nov-19	<p>(continued from above)</p> <p>This path is five feet away from people's bedroom windows and has no active surveillance. Several studies prove that crime and garbage increase in pathways that do not have active surveillance. We collected several hundreds of hypodermic needles while cleaning up our property. Planning Commissioner Cullen expressed her opinion stating that she did not like pathways without active surveillance as she has one near her and it is nothing but trouble.</p> <p>At least 2 burglaries have occurred when this pathway was open. They left an axe on our bedroom dresser.</p> <p>Several studies show a reduction of property values for those that abut public pathways.</p> <p>This pathway is not a necessity. It is outside of the school walking radius and is not required for emergency access.</p> <p>A better option is making Juanita drive a safer pedestrian pathway and a better way to spend taxpayer money that will benefit a benefit a larger portion of the population?</p> <p>The City of Kirkland waived the right to condemn our property in the recorded settlement agreement #20170526000143. This means that the pathway would need to fully go through the Kogan's property but the City would still have to compensate us for turning what used to be an easement that enhanced our property, to an easement that encumbers our property thus reducing our property values.</p> <p>Using the Kogan's property means that the pathway would enter tract B from the east side. There is a recorded restriction on the Chatam Ridge plat that states that Tract B can only be opened when it connects to the west end. This was a condition installed by the King County Council. The intent of this condition was to allow the developer to use tract B as part of their recreation requirement but not open it until our property was developed.</p> <p>Everyone in Chatam Ridge purchased their homes and had the titles insured with this restriction. Entering from the east side violates this restriction leaving the City open for lawsuits from every title company in Chatam Ridge, and the Kogan's. While we settled with the City on this issue Chatam Ridge and The Kogan's did not. They were not a party to our settlement agreement.</p> <p>Would not the tens of thousands of dollars it would take to open this pathway be better spent on projects with more urgency? Especially those that need emergency access?</p> <p>At this time, we ask that the City return P37 to private pay status to be opened upon development of our property.</p>
P37	Emailed letter	2-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P37.</a>
P37	Emailed letter	2-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P37.</a>
P37	Petition	18-Nov-19	<a href="#">Petition regarding P37.</a>

P37	Email	20-Nov-19	<p>Thank you for working with us and pointing out that ours is the only project that would be slated for condemnation and it is not fair with respect to all other projects to single us out. I have attached walking radius info for you to look at. Note that using the statistics presented, it would take a child 45 minutes to over an hour to walk to school from the lower neighborhood. The woman speaking in favor of P37 also mentioned that people cross Juanita drive to get to her neighborhood. Opening P37 would make crossing Juanita drive more frequent and more dangerous. I thought you may like to have this info prior to me sending it to the City Council. I will be submitting a formal letter with this information to the Council. Once again, thank you for your dedication to the City and for trying to do the right thing.</p>
P37	Emailed document	20-Nov-19	<p><a href="#">Document referenced in 20-Nov-19 email.</a></p>
P37	Email	5-Dec-19	<p>Dear Council Members:</p> <p>First, we would like to thank the council and the city staff for their hard work and dedication to this overwhelming and extensive project, and for understanding the passions and emotions that go along with it.</p> <p>At the November 19th Council Meeting, councilman Nixon asked the question: how far is the walking radius around Sandburg elementary in relation to connection P37?</p> <p>Attached are the following documents:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Lake Washington School District 1 mile radius walking policy.</li> <li>-The Lake Washington School District states the walking radius to school is one mile. Note this radius is determined as the crow flies and not by actual routes.</li> <li>-Lake Washington School District route finder information for our home. The closest to the school and the P37. connection.</li> <li>-Our home, 11724 80th Ave NE, is the closest to the school that would access P37 from the 80th Ave NE entrance. Our home is 1.49 miles away from the school as the crow flies. Our son had to take the bus to Sandburg elementary. P37 and 80th is almost a half mile outside of the school walking radius. This means Hermosa Vista and the lower neighborhoods are 1.75 to 2 miles or more from the school. Well outside the walking radius.</li> <li>-Statistics on the average walking time for an adult to walk a mile.</li> <li>-The average walking time for an adult to walk a mile is 20 minutes. It would take a child longer than this and this is if it is a direct route and there is not stopping time to play along the way.</li> <li>-Recommended school walking distances by "Safer Routes." The Safer Routes study states that the recommended walking distance for school routes is ½ mile for Kindergartners, 1 mile for elementary school kids, and 1.5 miles for high school kids. Sandburg is an elementary school.</li> </ul> <p>Utilizing the statistics stated above. It would take more than a half an hour for a child to walk to school from my house, as the crow flies. Longer because of course turns and waiting at crosswalks etc... Walking from 80th Ave NE and many places in the "curvy" Hermosa Vista neighborhood would take close to an hour or more. While this path was somewhat open we never witnessed children using it with backpacks walking to and from school. It was mostly used for people to walk their dogs. Walking dogs is not a necessity.</p> <p>We understand why the lower neighborhood may want this pathway, but there is no necessity for it. It is clearly not for emergency access and it is clearly outside of the school walking radius. Hermosa Vista has the best outlet to all of Kirkland using Juanita Drive. A want does not constitute a need.</p> <p>P37 was the only connection contemplated for condemnation. How can this be the only one in the entire City that would be condemned, using tax payer dollars to implement a path that has no legal connection. ESPECIALLY SINCE THERE ARE TWO OTHER OPTIONS AVAILABLE. The current map shows P37 and P37.1 returned to Private pay status, and we thank the staff for that, but because we encountered so many people against this connection, we are now asking that both P37 and P37.1 be removed from the connections map. The map is very confusing to the public and people currently still enter our property thinking it has public access to P37.1 and we are having to install a \$15,000.00 dollar gate just to protect our property and our privacy. Putting any private pay connections on a map could potentially keep people from improving their homes and cause confusion among the public. All connections like this should be addressed during any development submittal when the public is fully aware and can comment and/or appeal. Addressing these connections during development makes it unnecessary for them to be on the map.</p>

P37	Email	5-Dec-19	<p>(continued from above)</p> <p>We would also like to point out that the Woman that presented the pro P37-petition clearly stated that people cross Juanita Drive to access her neighborhood and stating that Juanita Drive was a dangerous road to cross. P37 will do nothing to alleviate this problem. In fact, it will only make it worse if P37 is open. Several council members expressed concerns over the safety of Juanita drive in connection to several other proposed pathways that would lead people to cross Juanita drive. Would it not make more sense to spend taxpayer dollars on pedestrian improvements to Juanita Drive making it safer for all in the area.</p> <p>For the following reasons we ask that P37 and P37.1 remain closed and be removed from the map:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This Walkway is not necessary. It is merely a "want." It is not needed for emergency access, and it is clearly outside the walking radius of the closest school, Sandburg elementary. Students take the bus now and will continue to do so. See attached School walking radius documents.</li> <li>2. This pathway did not exist prior to the construction of Chatham Ridge. Once cleared by this construction people began to criminally trespass across private property. Anyone stating they were using this pathway for years were committing a crime. We have attached recorded surveys and aerial photos showing it was physically impossible to use this path prior to Chatham Ridge. PLEASE NOTE THE FENCE OVER WHAT IS NOW TRACT B. Opening this path will reward and endorse criminal behavior.</li> <li>3. There are several studies showing that properties abutting public pathways have reduced property values. Property values were mentioned by the council as a concern for several other connections, but not P37.</li> <li>4. The P37 pathway has no active surveillance leaving it a perfect escape route for burglars. P37 is a long narrow corridor, almost like a tunnel. There is no active surveillance. Studies have shown that pathways with no active surveillance experience more crime and garbage. No one is watching. Cameras and lights will not solve this problem. They will shine into bedroom windows and spy on private property. There have been previous burglaries using this path as an escape route. At least two burglaries were committed when this pathway was open as belongings were found strewn along this path. King County Police Case # 09-11543. Documents can be provided upon request. There are several studies showing increased crime on pathways without active surveillance.</li> <li>5. This is not as cheap to implement as the staff may think. Our property contains a drainage ditch that is the outfall for the Chatham Ridge detention tank. To fence off our property would require an engineered culvert to tight-line and ensure the proper outfall from the detention tank. The Kogan;s property has mature landscaping and very large landscape rocks. Contrary to what Ms. Page told us, you cannot trim the trees so that you can walk around them. It would require heavy machinery to re-landscape this area. Chatham Ridge Tract B is currently just grass and brush. It will need to be cleared and a surface will need to be installed to walk on. If not, it will become very muddy. If the surface installed is at all considered partly or fully impervious, it will need storm drainage to ensure that the water run-off goes into the storm system and does not cause damage to our property. Both tract B and the Artoush pathway overly our roadway access easements. These easements cannot be altered in any way that would restrict, encumber, or infringe upon our access. This means no sidewalks, fencing, bollards, light posts, etc... that would do so. There will be an ongoing cost to the City for maintenance and clean-up of this pathway. Past experience has shown this to be a constant effort as pointed out in previous correspondence.</li> <li>6. This path is five feet away from people's bedroom windows and has no active surveillance. Several studies prove that crime and garbage increase in pathways that do not have active surveillance. We collected several hundreds of hypodermic needles while cleaning up our property. Planning Commissioner Cullen expressed her opinion stating that she did not like pathways without active surveillance as she has one near her and it is nothing but trouble.</li> </ol>
-----	-------	----------	---

P37	Email	5-Dec-19	<p>(continued from above)</p> <p>7. There is not a legal connection to connect Artoush and Tract B. The City of Kirkland waived the right to condemn our property in the recorded settlement agreement #20170526000143, documents previously provided. This means that the pathway would need to fully go through the Kogan's property but the City would still have to compensate us for turning what used to be an easement that enhanced our property to an easement that encumbers our property thus reducing our property values. Using the Kogan's property means that the pathway would enter tract B from the east side. King County Ordinance 15716 adopted recommendation 8.e states that the Chatham Ridge Tract B can only be opened when it connects to the west end. This document is attached. Official copies have been ordered from King County. This was a condition installed by the King County Council. The intent of this condition was to allow the developer to use tract B as part of their recreation requirement but not open it until our property was developed. They recognized that once our property was developed a natural connection between 80th and 82nd would be created through 117th place. The City of Kirkland also recognizes this and they have called it P37.1. Chatham Ridge is against this pathway and everyone in Chatham Ridge purchased their homes and had the titles insured with this restriction. Entering from the east side violates this restriction leaving the City open for lawsuits from every title company in Chatham Ridge, and the Kogan's. While we settled with the City on this issue, Chatham Ridge and The Kogan's did not. They were not a party to our settlement agreement.</p> <p>8. P37 increases several safety issues. Already mentioned is the public safety issue of no active surveillance, yet increased traffic crossing Juanita drive, as mentioned in the statement by the woman speaking on the pro side of the issue and several council members, is a very big public safety issue. Opening P37 will only encourage more people crossing Juanita Drive. If everyone is concerned about the safety of Juanita Drive, why would we want to encourage more people crossing it by opening P37 or P35. Furthermore, P37 terminates at the intersection of 117th and 82nd. This area has small narrow streets with very few intermittent sidewalks. People and Children will be walking down the middle of these roads that have blind corners. An accident waiting to happen.</p> <p>9. Other options exist. There is a connection from NE115th way /84thAve NE that can be made through proposed pathway P35. Document attached. This connection goes directly through the Hermosa Vista neighborhood. Connects directly to 84th where there are more sidewalks, has fewer residents that will be impacted by the increased traffic. Has comments in favor of it. Has more active surveillance. While it may be steeper, it can be made accessible with steps and switch backs.</p> <p>However, a sidewalk on Juanita drive is the best option, a safe walking sidewalk on Juanita Drive between 79th and 120th. Juanita drive is already public property, it is considered to have active surveillance, there are already lights on Juanita drive. A safe walking sidewalk can be achieved here and the connection will take the neighborhood to the same location as P37 from Juanita Drive through 120th. It will also allow access to the small commercial district and connections to the west of Juanita Drive with the sidewalks currently at the commercial district. Improving Juanita Drive is a much better option in light of the fact that safety on Juanita drive was mentioned several times in the November 19th meeting by both the Pro P37 people and several Council members.</p> <p>10. Once the two acres at 11724 80th Ave NE is developed there will be a connection from 80th to 117th place that will have active surveillance.</p> <p>11. The City has spent thousands of dollars on making Juanita Drive safer for cyclists. Isn't time to make it safer for pedestrians? Pooling the money that would go to all these smaller connection projects would go a long way making Juanita Drive a safer place to walk and ride. Improving Juanita drive solves so many issues, isn't time and money better spent on this project.</p> <p>12. The City has many projects that are more important and of actual need than a connection that is just a want and not a need. Shouldn't our tax dollars be spent on more important projects.</p>
P37	Emailed documents	5-Dec-19	<a href="#">Documents referenced in above email.</a>
P37	King County document	19-Nov-19	<a href="#">King County document related to Chatham Ridge development</a>
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	<p>I have lived in Hermosa Vista for 20 years. My two children would occasionally walk or bike to Carl Sandburg and Finn Hill before P37 was fenced off. The easement worked, even though it was unofficial.</p> <p>If you look on the map just south of P37, you'll notice an established footpath that connects 81st Ave NE and 115th Way NE. It is about 10ft wide, fenced on both sides. We walk it almost every day--with the kids, with the dogs--and we rarely see garbage. I believe the City maintains it, cutting back the ivy and honeysuckle a couple times a year. It is a valuable foot/bicycle connection in our neighborhood and it is a stellar example of how P37 could work if it were lighted, maintained, and well used.</p> <p>The two dead-end, non-connecting alleyways that are the current state of P37 are actually much more attractive to a nuisance element than a well-lit walkway that is frequently used by the residents and maintained by the City.</p>
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	<p>I have lived in Hermosa Vista for 35 years. Until recent years we used this path to connect with parks and family safely by walking/biking.</p> <p>A safe foot/bike path to connect Hermosa Vista with the rest of Finn Hill to our north.</p>
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	<p>This connection would make it safe for children to walk and/or bike from Hermosa Vista to Finn Hill MS, Carl Sandburg Elementary School, and Discovery Community School. Yes, there is a bus route that allows this, but many of the kids would like to travel by other means. Walking on Juanita even if sidewalks were put in would not provide the safety this pathway would.</p> <p>This pathway would also allow children to play with their school mates who live on the other side of the path. Currently they are cut off except for parent driven means.</p> <p>Opening the pathway also allows kids to access the open facilities at the aforementioned schools as well as participate in post school activities where bus transportation home is not provided.</p> <p>In regard to safety, I point out the existing connecting 115th way and 81st ave in Hermosa Vista. This is not a lit path, but has been kept clean and used by the neighborhood. Just because there is a path does not mean there has to be an increase in crime. In fact, one might argue that there would be less crime if the pathway is being occupied on a regular basis. Criminals and those who are doing activities that they should not be doing are looking for places that are not populated. Being constantly seen is not what they want.</p>
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	Juanita Drive is too dangerous for pedestrian traffic. This connection would allow all the kids in our neighborhood to safely walk to school.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	In favor of P37, please help us connect our neighborhood via a safe pedestrian pathway with the rest of Finn hill.

P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	I am a resident of Hermosa Vista right on 115th. I support P37 pedestrian proposed pathway. It creates the chance for kids to bike to school and eliminate the dangers of doing so in Juanita Dr.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	This is needed to connect neighborhoods to neighboring school for safe access and less vehicular trips. This pedestrian connection would open possibilities for many communities and provide MVT reduction in the process.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	This will keep kids off Juanita Drive. It could save lives! a connection between 80th Avenue NE and 82th Avenue NE, along NE 117th Street.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	This pathway has existed for 40 years and is super important for our neighborhood and the safety of kids and neighbors.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	I think that the comments made by the owner of the bordering property are unsubstantiated. The area surrounding the property on the Hermosa Vista side has changed and is now hosting 13 million dollar plus homes. To suggest that a fenced path will attract drug users or robbers more than when the area was an abandoned piece of land is absurd. It is in our (that of Hermosa Vista residents) best interest to maintain the path, keep it clean and well lit.
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	This was a connection that was used for decades by generations of residents. It was used by school kids and residence alike. My understanding is that the land/plot needed to revise this route is very small. I wholeheartedly support reopening of this connection.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	Please complete the pedestrian connection from the top of Finn Hill down to Hermosa Vista, Goat Hill, and Juanita Beach. I'm tired of driving my kids to their friends houses when we could reduce traffic by completing and maintaining the safe walking path.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	Reconnecting the p37 pathway will provide the 250 households in the combined neighborhoods to the schools and parks in Finn Hill. Having only Juanita Way as an access/egress path is a complete safety hazard for kids and is negligent on the part of The City of Kirkland. It is sad because it has completely ruined our family's opportunity to safely access any part of the hill by walking or biking. This path was cut off and The City of Kirkland has ignored the needs and rights of Hermosa Vista citizens to equal access. We really need someone with some courage and intelligence to solve this. Reopening the legacy pathway. Eminent Domain!!! The solution is straight forward and any negative impact is imagined or negligible.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	I support having the pedestrian connection. It's a long and dangerous walk along Juanita Drive for kids (or anyone) without it.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	This access route refers to a connection between 80th Avenue NE and 82th Avenue NE, along NE 117th Street. It has existed for 40+ years when the Hermosa Vista development was built, which can be verified by original home owners continuing to reside in the neighborhood. All that is required is an approximate 5ft x 5ft plot of land to complete the pathway connection. During the planning and development phase of the Chatham Ridge construction, Hermosa Vista residents worked with the Kirkland City Planning Department, along with the Finn Hill Neighborhood Association, to ensure the connection remained open and accessible.
P37	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	As a resident of the neighborhood I am fully supportive of P37
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	City of Kirkland - I write this because you have made our Juanita Drive a danger zone to not only to cars, but to bike riders, & pedestrians. You continue to add more homes without looking at the current infrastructure. You agreed to add 27 more homes into Hermosa Vista, which adds more traffic to our enclosed area. City of Kirkland - it's up to you find safe paths for families, dog walkers, & bikers to this area. It will never happen on Juanita Drive, so please create paths that connect neighborhoods. Wouldn't it be wonderful for kids to be able to walk or ride their bike to school / neighborhoods becoming a better community. Aren't we trying to find a way to remove the carbon footprint but instead City of Kirkland is realizing how greedy they can be by adding the numerous amount of houses to Kirkland. A simple path or trail that would connect our neighborhoods
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	Our neighborhood is trapped in a sense and have no pedestrian outlet to surrounding areas without going onto the busy and sometimes dangerous Juanita dr with our kids. Both kids go to Carl Sandburg and Finn hill MS and it would be wonderful if they could walk, run or ride bikes to school or to qfc shop center or even to Denny park without having to get onto Juanita dr. Much safer and thanks for your consideration in this matter.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	In support of petition to add pedestrian, bicycle pathway connection in Finn Hill
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	this isn't just about kids walking to school, its about all of us being connected and enjoying the wonderful parks and neighborhoods in our close proximity without having to use a vehicle. Connection between Lower Finn Hill and Upper Finn Hill reopens.
P37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	Prioritizing kids and their safety is the top priority of parents and our elected city officials will hopefully make sure this is realized.
P37, T37	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	For many years (27) I walked from Hermosa Vista to 84th St. Kids rode their bikes to school along the path. It is much safer than Juanita Drive. That path allows me to walk to church which I did for years before it was recently fenced off. Connect communities! From the end of 80th NE up to Finn Hill. We used to be able to walk up there and down to Goat Hill which was great exercise without driving. I am for more community connections.
P37	Email	18-Nov-19	I'm writing to add my support to the pathway proposed in P37. I have, until the past year or so been walking that pathway in order to access the Finn Hill neighborhoods above Hermosa Vista. In all that time, (I've resided in Hermosa Vista for 37 years) I have never seen any signs of trash, animal waste or drug use along that path. The path does go along the fence of some of the newer homes built, but in no way affects anybody living in those homes. While I have been using this path as a walking route for exercise purposes, it is also and more importantly the ONLY SAFE route for the children in Hermosa Vista and adjoining housing developments to access the elementary and junior high school. In a time where we are encouraging our children to get more exercise, this pathway provides a way to do that.  It is also my understanding that the builder of the homes at the top of the path agreed to leave that path open to pedestrians and bikes.

P37	Email	17-Nov-19	Connecting the Chatham Ridge pathway to the Woodland Heights pathway (referred to as P37) should be a priority for the Kirkland City Council because there are over 300 homes currently without a safe pedestrian access to anywhere outside of our neighborhoods. The other proposed connections already have alternate safe pedestrian routes. The current residents of Hermosa Vista, Timberlake, Juanita Point, and the future residents of Kirkland Crest and Woodlands Heights only have access to the rest of the city via Juanita Drive which is unsafe. (see Juanita Corridor Study).
P37	Email	4-Nov-19	I am a lifelong resident of Finn Hill. I've seen many changes up here but it has generally been considered a safe neighborhood. Opening a walking path from below will only make this less safe. Bad guys can hide in there and have an escape route to get away After stealing things or even harming kids playing outside. Don't believe me/ look up the Burke Gilman near Lake Forest Park. People would drive to their garages unload a grocery bag and while they walked into the kitchen some one would run down and steal from their garage in the 60 seconds they were not there. They could run away on the path before anyone knew anything. I'm strongly opposed to this trail and lets leave it how it always was as a fenced off non accessible Area. No need change what's already working.
P37	Email	4-Nov-19	Our family objects to the construction of P37 Public Walkway.  We did not know about this walkway until recently and it affects the neighborhood in which we live. Because I am a business owner and mother of two small kids, I have not had a chance to discuss this matter, ask questions, or attend your meetings.  I am the Homeowner's Association President at Chatham Ridge.  My husband and I are concerned about the security of our home and property, as this walkway would provide access for random pedestrians. It is not needed for emergency access -- it is outside of the walkway radius for the nearest school Carl Sandburg Elementary. Additionally, P37 is a long narrow corridor like a tunnel with no active surveillance, where folks can use cameras and lights to shine into bedrooms of homes. Would you want this for your family?  The City has many projects that are more important and greater than P37. Please consider this email in your next meeting. I am also signing a petition from our neighborhood. I look forward to your response.
P37	Email	4-Nov-19	Hello, Members of the Kirkland City Council, and others- It has been brought to our attention that there is a plan to improve and open a Public Walkway (Connection P37 of the Citywide Connections Map). I have attached a copy of a plan showing the location of this walkway. I am adamantly opposed to this walkway, for the following reasons: -I have lived in this neighborhood (Hermosa Vista) since 1992. One of the greatest attributes to this area is the sense of isolation and protection. I am not anti-social, but we prefer not to encourage visitors from outside of our neighborhood who may have intent other than "walking on a pathway." So, yes, I fear that crime may increase due to this walkway. -It makes no sense to create this walkway. It would start at 80th Ave. NE, and travel east onto 82nd Ave. NE. Currently, these neighborhoods are not connected, and I don't see the value in changing that condition. Perhaps this is a part of our Progressive Culture (to connect neighborhoods), but why should we be required to partake in those ideologies? -There would be no active surveillance of this pathway, thereby becoming a temptation for people that would do us harm. -Our tax dollars should be used for more important projects. -Finally, we voted against annexation into Kirkland, but were annexed nevertheless. I'm still trying to see the benefits of that annexation. However, I've only seen restricted yard waste pick-up (used to be able to put out 9 extra bags), the privilege of paying business licensing fees (I run a small business), and having to deal with issues such as this planned walkway. You would go a long way in helping us have a better appreciation for the Kirkland City Council if you decide not to go with this project. -By the way, I was told that there was a postcard mailing regarding this project, but I can assure you that we never received one. I only found out about this a few days ago through word-of-mouth.  Thanks for listening.
P37	Map attachment	4-Nov-19	<a href="#">Map referenced in above email.</a>

P37	Email	1-Nov-19	<p>Regarding the proposed walkability connection P37</p> <p>While I was helping the Whites establish the South and South EAST property lines at 11724 80th, I discovered a dump site that included two huge garbage bags and a few broken garbage bags. They were filled with paraphernalia like burnt tinfoil, baggies and hundreds of needles. We have since closed off access to that area where the proposed walkway is and hope to keep it that way.</p> <p>The Whites had me put up fencing and establish property lines hoping to maintain the privacy rights that I have worked so hard to help them establish.</p> <p>In the past weeks working at a projects on the Whites home we have noticed an increase of non-residents lurking around new developments. This is concerning because of the increased traffic and lower lighting during the winter, lack of public transportation in the area.</p> <p>I am also a resident of the City of Kirkland and I feel my tax dollars could be better spent on more important projects. It would be great to make it safer for pedestrians on Juanita Drive for example.</p> <p>I ask at this time that you not open pathway P37. It is a long narrow corridor and over the years , I have seen nothing but problems with it.</p>
P37	Email	4-Nov-19	<p>I am writing to oppose P37. I live on NE 117th and am concerned about the easy access more people and therefore more crime will bring. If you open that up, anybody could easily come to the back of that neighborhood and if a garage is open or something is in the back yard, steal it. If they the kind of people who steal things, they may have guns. All off these possibilities go away if you simply leave that area as it is.</p> <p>Also with a path there you will find not only walker and joggers, but cyclists and electric bike riders. Do you know how fast an electric bike can go...uphill? There will be all kinds of near misses with kids or walkers, elderly people, dogs, etc. Again, all of this goes away if you leave the area as it is.</p> <p>We have our walking areas up here. We feel its safe and a great neighborhood because its a walking and driving dead end. Opening it up is greatly going to increase pedestrian and cycling traffic, taking away from what it is now...a quiet safe neighborhood.</p> <p>Please leave this area as it as and vote no on P37.</p>
P37	Emailed Letter	21-Oct-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P37.</a>
P37	Attachment to Letter	21-Oct-19	<a href="#">Attachment (Settlement Agreement) to the above letter regarding P37.</a>
P37	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a>
P37	Emailed Letter	28-Oct-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P37.</a>
P37	Online Comment	24-Sep-19	I have been reading the public comments about this connection and I noticed that my comments are mysteriously missing. I am the homeowner of this property and access easement and I am disappointed and appalled that the City would put the burden on private property owners to make these connections that would benefit the public. If the public wants these they should put their money together and pay for sidewalks on Juanita drive. This connection will never happen as I do not plan on giving up my private property rights. You foudn the money to make cycling improvements on Juanita drive. It is now time to make pedestrian improvements on Juanita drive.
P37	Online Comment	15-Jun-19	Please look to involve the community if purchase negotiations with the northern property owner end up being too expensive. Perhaps the community could help there.
P37	Online Comment	15-Jun-19	Connecting the Hermosa Vista neighborhood to the rest of Finn Hill through P37 is a high-priority objective to enhance safe and healthy travel options for school aged kids enrolled at Carl Sandburg Elementary and Finn Hill Elementary. On behalf of the kids in our neighborhood today and for generations to come, please finalize the connection of the two existing easements to the South of Chatham Ridge and the North of the new Artoush development.
P37	Online Comment	19-Jun-19	<p>During the forum on 15 June, it was suggested that to open this private easement would be akin to allowing someone to walk through your backyard. I would ask that if those comments were recorded for the comment worksheet that either they be stricken from the record OR have an additional comment next to them. Please only add if my information is correct...</p> <p>This is a private easement which means...</p> <p>a) the owner of the property cannot do anything in this area. If they do, when the easement is open, they forfeit that work they did in it.</p> <p>b) this easement is similar to the easement anyone else has on their property as it relates to the space for a sidewalk. The sidewalk is part of our property, but is not yours to do with as you please. If you don't have a sidewalk, when one is put in anything you have planted in that area is subject to being pulled up.</p> <p>Words matter, especially on government documents. And I think it is important that if a comment is made that gives an impression that is incorrect, it should be corrected or shown that it is inaccurate.</p>
P37	Email	17-Jun-19	This connection I would definitely be in favor of, particularly since with the new construction back there a decent portion of the work seems to be done. I would welcome this connection as a way for kids in this neighborhood to potentially walk to school, or for me personally it would be great to be able to walk/run/cycle out of this neighborhood without navigating what I would consider a fairly dangerous road for those three activities, Juanita drive. Currently if I want to walk the dog/run/bike I'm getting in the car and driving somewhere which seems a shame and is adding a car trip to already congested roads.

P37	Email	16-Jun-19	A few of our neighbors made us aware of the initiative for safer routes. I'm not sure why it took so long for me to notice as it's been such a concern for our family since we moved here 4 years ago. I love my neighborhood. The idea of finally being connected to Finn Hill with a simple path(s) for walkers & bikers is just incredible -we would love to help promote this. Just the thought that my kids to ride their bike to school, or hang out with friends without using a car, or, able to enjoy nice walk or bike ride without relying on the car. As you know, the development continues to happen without any thought of the impact to the environment, safety, or school population. Our brand new schools already are busting at the seams. How many more houses can fit in Kirkland!!! Why do I have 22 more UGLY homes being built in Hermosa Vista. Traffic has tripled, which means more accidents & road rage ....
P37	Email	2-Jun-19	I live in Hermosa Vista and we are really fighting for a safe way for our kids to get to school Juanita Way scares me. Please put me on the supporters list to open the path back up.
P37	Email	31-May-19	I have been a firm supporter in creating a safe pedestrian/bike path out of the Hermosa Vista and Timberlake neighborhoods. I've been waiting for years for the two sides of a pedestrian/bike path connecting the end of 80th Ave NE to 82nd Ave NE. Please make this happen. There are over 250 homes in the Hermosa Vista and Timberlake neighborhood. There are over 50 kids under the driving age that would like to walk/bike to school and sports activities. But we can NOT safely walk/bike out of our neighborhood thanks to Mrs. White. If you ask some of the original neighbors, they will tell you there used to be THREE safe ways to leave our neighborhood and get up to Finn Hill. In fact that is how the middle schoolers walked to school. I moved into the area 15 years ago and I was able to walk to the schools and sports fields via one of the existing original pathways. But since there has been so much construction, ALL our SAFE pathways have since been blocked. I do not consider walking/biking along Juanita Drive as a safe option for myself or children. For years, I've been attending the city planning meetings and community outreach events. I've talked to council members to get this issue on the table. I've gotten petitions signed. I've had discussions with Scott Morris from the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance. Two years ago, I had a few Eagle Scouts and many neighbors willing to create a pathway through the Juanita Woodlands. Basically we were going to create a pathway parallel to 80th Ave NE and just continue it to NE 120th St. But the head of Juanita Woodlands wouldn't let us "because of the deer." I have since discovered Mrs. White was the president of the Juanita Woodlands at the time and happened to own the property adjacent to Juanita Woodlands and our planned pathway. I am so frustrated that one woman (Mrs. White) has so much power over the city to prevent over 250 families access to their neighbors, schools, and parks. I've hear the city repeat how they want to make it so all neighborhoods are connected via pedestrian/bike paths. How come our neighborhood is being neglected? Our neighborhood does not have access to any parks either. Those same Eagle Scouts were willing to help create a pocket park in the large island on 81st Ave NE. But the city prevented that from happening too because they said it wasn't safe. Currently our children have to play in the street. How is that safe? We could have put a fence around the entire park and created a safe crosswalk. But the city didn't see the need to create a safe place for over 50 children to play. Please make it possible for us to safely walk/bike to schools, parks, and neighbors.
P37	Email	27-May-19	I am writing to let you know that we are in total support of the path to connect Hermosa Vista to Finn Hill. For years I walked from my home to Finn Hill and I have missed being able to do so. I also wish to be able to provide the children in our neighborhood with a safe path for walking and biking to school. It is so important for our children to have the opportunity to get some much needed exercise, if they desire.
P37	Email	26-May-19	great to hear that this project is moving forward. As you know we have been pushing for this for months and have been in contact about two years ago. We want you to know that we are in total support and please make sure this is finally implemented.
P37	Email	26-May-19	I would like to voice my support of the new proposed bicycle path to Sandburg Elementary. I think this is a critical piece of infrastructure needed in our community for our young children to be able to get to school on their own.
P37	Email	26-May-19	I am writing to add my support for the proposal to open the cyclepath that allows access from Hermosa Vista students to Carl Sandburg without having to go in Juanita Dr given how dangerous it would be for a school aged kid to cycle in Juanita Dr. Thanks again for coordinating the Safer Routes to School efforts. These are critical to our community.
P37	Email	17-May-19	Thank you for reaching back out – the connection I am looking at specifically is the one relating specifically to the Finn Hill improvements connecting to Carl Sandburg elementary.
P37	Email	20-May-19	We own a home in the Finn Hill -Juanita Drive area. For years my family has been hoping for a safe working trail in our area that we can access without having to drive to. A SAFER Juanita Drive is the ideal, but for now the connecting path between 80 <sup>th</sup> Ave NE to 82 <sup>nd</sup> Ave NE is a great alternative. This will allow clear and SAFE access to the rest of Finn Hill and Sandburg and Finn Hill schools for the children. We are fully in support of it!
P37	Email	19-May-19	A path & cycleway is something the Hermosa Vista and Timberlake neighborhoods would greatly benefit from. It would be fantastic for the whole neighborhood to be able to walk to see friends on the Hill and vice versa. This isn't just about giving kids access to walk/bike to school (which is great, don't get me wrong!). It's more than that, it's about joining up full neighborhoods, adding pedestrian and cycle ways, helping to reduce the numbers of cars that have to do 'local' trips to friends who live just above us. There is already a paved path waiting to be used but currently padlocked. We can see the playground on the other side of the overgrown blackberry bushes where our friends live but we have to drive around the entire lower hill to visit them... we just need this small bit of land to be opened. It seems so insane access hasn't happened by now but I sincerely hope many of my friends and neighbors contact you voicing their approval. Many thanks for your support at Kirkland City Council.
P37	Email	19-May-19	I am writing to voice strong support for the completion of a safe walking/biking route from the Hermosa Vista neighborhood to the Carl Sandberg, Finn Hill middle school, parks, and extensive streets and walkways in the broader neighborhood. We and hundreds of other children and parents have been using this trail for years to safely walk our children to school and to the outdoor recreation areas at these schools. This is the only off-street walkway, is grandfathered for continuous use and should remain in active and popular use.
P37	Email	17-May-19	I am writing as a resident of Hermosa Vista in the Finn Hill area off of Juanita arrive. We are in full support of the connection via a pedestrian/bike path of 80th & 82nd in order for our children to have a safe walking/bike access to their schools and parks that does not involve them having to travel on the increasingly busy and dangerous Juanita Drive. We have lived here for nearly 6 years and this has been a big topic and concern for all of our neighbors. My children and their friends are always disappointed that the only means of getting to school and sports parks (which are so close) involve a car or bus to get there. We appreciate your consideration of approving this path.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	Let us walk for our kid's well being.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to school with my friends.

P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to school.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to school and to baseball.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to be able to walk home from school because sometimes it takes a long time to figure out how I'm getting home.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to the park.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to bike.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to my friend's house.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	Safer walkway to school.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to bike to school with a friend.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to be able to walk to the beach.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to walk to school.
P37	Community Meeting - Children Signs	15-Jun-19	I want to bike to school so I can get exercise and my mom doesn't have to drive me.
P37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	P-37: there is a fenced in path behind the new development. The streets where the houses are being built. There is a six foot wide section (it's 15 feet) is an access easement. (an agreement with the City of Kirkland, if the connection to the north occurs, it has to be on the west end, if it ever connects to Chattum ridge)
P37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	What is a private easement? A legal right for a private property owner to allow others to use that land.
P37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Q-P37- will the school bus still run? Would Kirkland maintain the trails? Neighborhood volunteers could also help.
P37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Hermosa vista, existing neighborhood pathway. No litter, have had burglaries but you cant prevent that today. Private property concerns are recognized.
P37	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	P37- would like access to school, hears concerns. Pathway that is currently used has a fence, maybe the city can build a fence, put in a light, surveillance camera if needed, participate in neighborhood garbage pickup. If there is a problem maybe the neighborhood can solve it.
P37	Hand Delivery	15-Jun-19	<a href="#">Petition regarding P37.</a>
P37	Online Comment	16-Jun-19	As a resident of Hermosa Vista, I fully support this pedestrian connection to the rest of Finn Hill. As parents of young kids, we have no good options for walking outside our own small neighborhood loop as Juanita drive traffic is heavy. Allow us a greater connection to our Finn Hill neighbors. There is no reason for a vehicle connection, but there is a strong case for a pedestrian connection.
P37	Online Comment	17-Jun-19	I would like to write in support of pedestrian connection P37. To be able to walk to/from the Hermosa Vista neighborhood would be a valuable addition in the sense that it would enable children to walk to school and walkers/runners/cyclists to access Juanita proper without having to navigate Juanita drive, which while somewhat improved is still dangerous given the speed of automobile traffic. Currently if I want to walk the dog or bike/run somewhere other than Hermosa Vista then I have to add an automobile trip in order to get somewhere safe.

P37	Email	30-Oct-19	<p>We were unaware that our property was slated for possible condemnation to open walkway P37. No one from the City has approached us in quite some time and we did not receive the post card. We do not want P37 to be open for the following reasons.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-This walkway is a threat to our security. We do not want this walkway because we are very concerned about the security of our home and property. P37 is a long narrow corridor, almost like a tunnel. There is no active surveillance. Studies have shown that pathways with no active surveillance experience more crime and garbage.</li> <li>-This walkway is not a necessity. It is only wanted by the lower neighborhood. Our neighborhood does not want it.</li> <li>-It is not needed for emergency access and is outside the walking radius for schools. This walkway is not needed for emergency access purposes and is outside of the walking radius of the nearest school, Sandburg Elementary.</li> <li>-It will lower our property values. We have learned that there are several studies showing that properties abutting public pathways have reduced property values (found in 2006 study of the Burke Gillman Trial). Property values were mentioned as a concern for several other connections, but not P37. Taking this information into consideration, we are very concerned about losing a portion of our property, which will lower its value.</li> <li>-Many studies show that crime is increased in walkways where no one is watching. This walkway does not have active surveillance. It is a perfect escape route for burglars. •do not want cameras or lights shining and spying on our property. Cameras and lights have been suggested as protective purposes, but these would be an invasion of our privacy. Would you want lights and cameras shining in and spying in your bedroom windows? And who would monitor the cameras? By the time perpetrators were seen, they would be long gone.</li> <li>-Other options exist to reach the same goal. For example, there is a connection from NE 115 th Way &amp; 84th Ave NE that can be used as the proposed pathway P35. Since Juanita Drive is already a public property, it is considered to have active surveillance and already has lights set up. A safe walking sidewalk can still be achieved, and the connection will take the neighborhood to the same location as P37 from Juanita Drive through 120th. It will also allow access to the small commercial district and connections to west of Juanita Drive, with the sidewalks currently at the commercial district. We believe this is a much better option.</li> <li>-We prefer you spend our tax dollars on sidewalks for Juantia drive or projects more important and urgent than this one.</li> <li>-It is not fair that we should have to give up our property and beautiful landscaping just because the lower neighborhood wants to walk here.</li> <li>-We are against opening P37. Condemnation is a very serious action and should not be taken lightly. It should only be used in extreme situations, when no other choices are available.</li> </ul> <p>Thank you for your time and consideration on this very important matter.</p>
P35	Email	17-Jun-19	<p>This connection I would definitely be in favor of, particularly since with the new construction back there a decent portion of the work seems to be done. I would welcome this connection as a way for kids in this neighborhood to potentially walk to school, or for me personally it would be great to be able to walk/run/cycle out of this neighborhood without navigating what I would consider a fairly dangerous road for those three activities, Juanita drive. Currently if I want to walk the dog/run/bike I'm getting in the car and driving somewhere which seems a shame and is adding a car trip to already congested roads.</p>
P35	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	<p>As a resident in the neighborhood I am in full support of p35!</p>
P35	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	<p>P35- lived there for 19 years. Kids in the neighborhood used to walk to Sandberg, it's like a black diamond ski slope. Not sure how feasible it is for walking. Would love p34, as it would connect to goat hill, and would connect neighborhood to Juanita without walking on Juanita drive/. P36 is also wanted. P37, any attempt to purchase property from other owner? Still pursuing. A39 property should also be pursued.</p>
P34	Online Comment	15-Jun-19	<p>Overall we agree with P34 connection. Just two concerns:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This connection only makes sense, if NE 116 Pl provides safe sidewalks. That road is steep and narrow. It can be dangerous to walk with kids without sidewalks.</li> <li>2. Street parking on 84th Ave NE (on south from P34) should be only allowed for the residents to limit car traffic (so kids stay safe). Only pedestrian access to 84th Ave NE should be allowed.</li> </ol>
P34	Email	17-Jun-19	<p>This connection I would definitely be in favor of, particularly since with the new construction back there a decent portion of the work seems to be done. I would welcome this connection as a way for kids in this neighborhood to potentially walk to school, or for me personally it would be great to be able to walk/run/cycle out of this neighborhood without navigating what I would consider a fairly dangerous road for those three activities, Juanita drive. Currently if I want to walk the dog/run/bike I'm getting in the car and driving somewhere which seems a shame and is adding a car trip to already congested roads.</p>
P34	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	<p>I am a resident of Hermosa Vista right on 115th. I support P34 pedestrian proposed pathway. It creates the opportunity to walk to Juanita Village and Juanita Beach without the dangers of doing so in Juanita Dr. The community needs more walking paths.</p>
P34	Online Comment	18-Nov-19	<p>I am a resident of Hermosa Vista right on 115th way. I support P34 pedestrian proposed pathway. It creates the chance for kids to bike to school and eliminate the dangers of doing so in Juanita Dr.</p>
P34	Online Comment	19-Nov-19	<p>As a resident of the neighborhood I am supportive of P34</p>
P33	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
P33	Email	15-Oct-19	<p>As mentioned in the previous email I am not certain the impact on personal property has been weighed against proposed benefit of connections particularly with my separate two lots. As transportation connection planning was not aware if reduction of buildable lots had been considered I checked today with Kirkland planning and confirmed that currently there are 3 buildable lots if subdivided on my separate east lot (parcel 1270000200) and that a path of typical size would reduce that to 2 given the square footage threshold. Not sure of the exact going market rate for a lot is but would think it is in the 400-500k range in our neighborhood. So any developer would look at a path requirement in determining the value. That is a significant negative impact to the value of the property as a result of inclusion in the plan with no consideration of the value loss to the current owner.</p>

P33	Email	12-Oct-19	<p>One of the proposed connections, P33, is of particular concern to me. The proposed pedestrian path runs through the two lots I own. This reason cited as connecting pathways is not true as there is no path on the east end. It is also cited as a safer route to walk to school or bus but that is not true as well as in fact 86th is a busier road. This benefit / cost to the city makes no sense. Even if T41 is developed, which I object to as well, it still makes no sense as walking north would be quicker.</p> <p>This was not a requested development of the neighborhood in the couldesac. It is at the very most a .1 mile walk to 86th from the furthest point in the couldesac.</p> <p>I understand this is subject to future development but as such even having it on the proposed map would significantly destroy value in my property as it would be "required" even upon a major remodel. It could also reduce the number of buildable lots that would result in a huge decrease in value of the properties. Additionally, the only access to the property on the east is where the proposed pathway would go so by doing so would block access. If the proposed path remains on the potential map I would think that only the city would be the one responsible for the destruction of property value.</p> <p>The postcard received states that the city has been collecting feedback since May. There has been significant feedback in the paths/roads in this neighborhood including a signed petition of a large group of neighbors. This feedback has seemed to be ignored and had no impact on the map which is disappointing as I see no changes from these same routes that were proposed earlier in the year.</p> <p>I really hope that I will see removal of this proposed path for the reasons above.</p>
P33	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	<p>The proposed pedestrian path is directly south of my property. This connection is basically a path to nowhere. It doesn't connect any two paths as is stated in the objective and the neighbors at the east end of it would prefer not to have traffic there. It makes no sense to have a path that will have to be maintained and would not be utilized. It is a simple .1 mile walk by road to 86th ave at the farthest end of the current road. It would also result in a decrease in property value given that any development would be burdened with the "requirement" that this path to be put in on existing land that is part of the property. Who is going to responsible for this decrease in value to the current owners should this go through? I strongly object for all these reasons.</p>
P33	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	<p>P33- not in the literature, it is on the maps. An existing walkway there, this connection would go through a house. If the street were to go parallel to the city park, a home has sold but the owner hasn't occupied so they don't know this is happening. You can come up the walk way on the streets to connect to goat hill. Owned the property since 1954 and paid taxes on it. Has issue with the city invading the personal property with no justification and no notification. Is informing neighbors, due to not receiving any notification from the city.</p>
P32	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>
P31.3	Email	17-Oct-19	<p>In reviewing the information on Kirkland Citywide Connections project, I have comments on parts of it.</p> <p>I see some people have proposed pathway connections running through their house and property. This can drop the value of their property and/or totally destroy it.</p> <p>It can create more crime. It gives another escape route for persons doing crime, such as breaking into your home, car, stealing and etc.</p> <p>Transportation Connection will give a path for drug users to dispose of their needles and etc. A place for trash and other garbage. If the city of Kirkland wishes to keep a nice clean city, then it will require additional city employees. More expense for the city.</p> <p>The path can become a place where persons can use it for various crime, ie persons being attacked, robbed and extra noise for the home owners.</p> <p>These paths may reduce a couple of blocks of walking to school for some students. The extra two blocks may help some students reduce their weight some.</p> <p>I am opposed to this project.</p>
P31.1	Hand Delivery	12-Jun-19	<p><a href="#">Letter regarding P31.1</a></p>
P28	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	<p>Kamiakin kids could walk across this bridge to get to school. It also connects neighborhoods to parks.</p>
P27	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	<p>This would help us get to the bus.</p>
T29.1, P23.2	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	<p>Extend T29.1 to connect across to Slater Ave NE to the east.</p> <p>P23.2 should be proposed as a full street and continue south to Slater Ave NE.</p> <p>In general, we should create a plan for blocks that are closer to 200-300 feet in length in our planned urban areas (such as across the Totem Lake District) to support pedestrian activity, shorten street crossings (by having more short crossings rather than one big crossing), create more on-street parking, and create more storefront opportunities.</p> <p>With 1800 feet between NE 116th St and NE 124th St, and 1800 feet between 405 and Slater (on average), we should be adding four to six more North/South avenues and East/West streets in this area.</p>
P20	Public Hearing comment	24-Oct-19	<p><a href="#">Comment provided as part of the Public Hearing at the 10-24-19 Planning Commission Meeting. Link is to the public hearing agenda item, not the specific comment.</a></p>

P20	Online Comment	29-Oct-19	<p>Path P20 as proposed: Starts on NE 112th ST and proceeds down 108th Ave NE (an existing street) heading south to NE 111th PL where 108th Ave NE ends. From there it continues south through an existing garage attached to an existing house and on south through two additional properties that are accessed through a cul-de-sac on 108th Ave NE. This path intrudes on 3 existing occupied properties. The house numbered 11003 108th Ave NE would have this path pass within ~10 feet of their bedroom window on the north west side. The proposed path on the properties being intruded on would have to negotiate an extremely steep slope from north to south as well as an extremely steep grade on the west side (compound angle) of the proposed path. Would require large retention walls as well as possible step.</p> <p>Alternate proposal: Path P20 alternate proposal: Starts on NE 112th ST and proceeds down 106th Ave NE (an existing street) heading south to NE 110th ST. At the intersection of 106th Ave NE and NE 110th ST turn left (east) onto NE 110th ST where it dead ends. At the dead end there is an existing City of Kirkland path that connects with 108th Ave NE. This proposal would have the following benefits: If the intent is to facilitate expansion on that portion of 108h Ave NE that intersects with NE 111th PL – Access already exists. If the intent is to facilitate expansion along 108th PL NE – Access already exists. Current proposal of P20 would cost hundreds of thousands if not millions of dollars. Alternate Proposed Plan dated 10/29/2019 would cost \$0 as it already exists and makes more sense.</p>
P18	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	This one would be great to have, since then I'd be able to get from my new house to Juanita bay park without having to walk along 98th ave. I think you could do it easier by connection from the south end of 101st ave westwards to the existing trail that goes under the power lines.
P16	Email	19-Nov-19	<p>Recently, we were made aware of the planning effort resulting in the Kirkland Citywide Connections map. For those of us in the area of 2nd and 3rd Streets and 19th Place at the north end of Norkirk, it was a rude surprise to see that one of the proposed projects is a pedestrian pathway through the natural greenbelt north of our homes. We expect that this will be a serious invitation to crime in an area that has always been very secure. All of us face away from the proposed path with no security of occupants to the north watching it. We also consider it potentially dangerous for schoolchildren who might use it to get to Kirkland Middle School or Crestwoods Park.</p> <p>After neighborhood discussion, we drafted the attached letter, map and petition to document our opposition to that project. We would appreciate your review, consideration and deletion of P16 as it would change the nature of our neighborhood greatly.</p>
P16	Email	19-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter and petition regarding P16 referenced in above 19-Nov-19 email.</a>
P16	Online Comment	25-Oct-19	<p>The P16 connector raises several concerns:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- The proposed path raises security concerns for homeowners whose properties back up to the new path as it would provide easy access to the rear of properties previously buffered by the park.</li> <li>- The soil stability and water saturation levels of the proposed path location would increase project costs. The current area serves as a rain water garden to reduce runoff and flooding.</li> <li>- This proposed path would reduce and disturb animal habitats frequented by a deer herd</li> <li>- Sidewalks along 19th Ave between Market and 3rd would resolve pedestrian safety concern and provide more walkability access to larger number of neighbors throughout this quadrant of the neighborhood.</li> </ul>
P16	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	Compared with putting sidewalks on 19th Avenue between Market and 3rd, this project will have less impact on the neighborhood and would be more expensive.  Sidewalks on 19th avenue between Market and 3rd or 4th St. From traffic studies done by the city, we know that 1200-1400 cars PER DAY are on this two-lane road. There are no sidewalks, so as cars are driving sometimes 30mph (source: same traffic study from May 2019), there is nowhere for my kids to walk safely. Numerous emails have been sent to the city about this route and I'm shocked and outraged that it's not on this proposal.
P16	Online Comment	11-Oct-19	As a homeowner whose house would back up to the proposed P16 connection (connecting 20th Avenue NE from 1st Street to 3rd Street), I support this pedestrian connection as long as it is PAVED (so it is useful in the rain / all year), the path goes through currently city-owned land, and appropriate / tall screening landscape or fencing is placed to preserve my privacy and keep walkers off my private property.
P16	Online Comment	22-Oct-19	P16, which provides a pedestrian pathway along the 20th Avenue corridor from 1st to 3rd, would be a major disruption to existing neighborhood. The proposal would provide easy access to the rear of a number of properties and increase the likelihood of crime in the 19th Place cul-de-sac. The proposed pedestrian path is only about 15 ft. from existing homes and would destroy many existing large trees. Security would be a major issue as this would be a pipeline for criminal and other mischief into what is currently a well-protected neighborhood. This project is a poor substitute for the project being suggested below since it does not provide a good connection from Market to Kirkland Middle School/Crestwoods Park.
P11	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	20-May-19	Fear that high schoolers would break lights if we had pedestrian lighting here
P10	Emailed letter	1-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P10.</a>
P08.1	Online Comment	15-Oct-19	with the connections created by P08 the P08.1 investment seems unnecessary and not a good use of the available funds.

P04.1	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Good idea for this connection
P03.1	Letter	21-Oct-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P03.1.</a>
P03	Online Comment	17-Jun-19	I live on the street they are proposing the new pedestrian pathway. The road has sidewalks on both sides of the street. Making this street a One-Way in separating directions will make it impossible for me to reach my house without driving around the whole neighbor in a circle. There is no need for any changes as the road is already pedestrian friendly enough.
P03	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	20-May-19	Please, this is quieter than walking on 124th
P02.3	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	I'm pretty sure this connection already exists! I have used it a bunch of times when going from the CKC to the metropolitan market.
P02.3	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Already exists - but isn't formalized so we would need to formalize if this property was to redevelop?
P02	Emailed letter	1-Nov-19	<a href="#">Letter regarding P02.</a>
P02	Email	24-Oct-19	<p>This is the best contact I could find with which to comment on the City Wide connections map.</p> <p>Yesterday, I received in a packet of mail from my mail receiving service, the postcard to those within 300' of proposed transportation connections. I just had the opportunity to read the postcard. It seems like a late notice considering our nearness to one of the proposed connections and that the process has been ongoing since May. I would like to know when this connection was proposed and by whom.</p> <p>I'm referring to the pedestrian crossing proposed at Second Street South near our home at 746 2nd. St. So.. The map identifies it as P02. However, in the "comments to date section" of the web site there is no accurate reference to a P02 at this area. These references are to other areas of the city nowhere near this one.</p> <p>These initial comments, at this late date of notice, are for the record and hopefully they get to the Planning Commission tonight. I am out of town and with this late notice cannot make the meeting.</p> <p>This area has been private property since it was platted over a hundred years ago. We are only the third owner of the area have owned it for fifty years. It will always be private as we have no plans to ever turn it to the public. It was our vision to acquire the property for private use, not the public.</p> <p>We request this connection, once accurately identified, be removed immediately from any City proposals.</p> <p>Thank you in advance for receiving these comments and passing them to the Planning Commission and the City process.</p> <p>Respectfully,</p>
P02	Online Comment	13-Jun-19	We recently moved into Finn Hill and would love a pedestrian connection through Juanita Heights Park. This would make the park accessible for more people and increase the walkability of the neighborhood. Walking to downtown Juanita could be an option for us and many others instead of having to go around on Juanita Drive!
P_New	Online Comment	4-Nov-19	Over a decade ago, we could walk from Holmes Point Drive NE, up NE 124th St., continuing on 68th Ave. NE, and then on the ridge, connecting to 72nd Ave. NE. This access has been blocked by the owner at the end of the road. Is there a way to open this up again?
P_New	Online Comment	28-Oct-19	<p>The South side of Kirkland Avenue both east and west of 6th Street has no sidewalk. To get from the Cross Kirkland Corridor (CKC) to downtown, a pedestrian must cross Kirkland Ave four (4) times. The path from the CKC is on the South side of Kirkland Ave. A pedestrian must cross to the North side of Kirkland Ave with no crosswalk, then cross to the South side at the intersection with 6th St, cross 6th St, then cross back to the North side of Kirkland Ave, then cross Kirkland Ave yet again at the intersection with Kirkland Way.</p> <p>When I made this suggestion one year ago through the Suggest-A-Project Interactive Map, I was told, "This project is funded in the preliminary 2019-2014 [typo?] Capital Improvement Program with anticipated design to start in 2022 and construction in 2023." Is this project still on the books?</p>
P_New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	Pedestrian connection, cross I-405 along NE 140th St
P_New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	Create a connection in Totem Lake to evergreen hill - NE 128th Place down to 124th Lane NE
P New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	NE 138th Place (east of 97th Avenue NE and west of 100th Ave NE) need a pedestrian pathway to connect this neighborhood - James Kumin 9727 NE 138th Place - development currently underway PRE180333
P New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	20-May-19	Pedestrian and bicycle connection needed from 132nd Avenue NE to NE124th Street (north of Lake Washington Institute of Technology) - pipeline right of way. (No development option as it is SPU property. Could be a CIP project if SPU granted an easement.
P New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	20-May-19	Need trails through NRH3 open space in Parks layer (North Rose Hill) to connect 126th Place NE, 126th Avenue NE.
P New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	15-May-19	Possible connection to Goat Hill
P New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	13-May-19	Connect 3rd Avenue S with 4th Avenue S west of 6th Street - continuation of the pedestrian pathway connecting ultimately to Lakeview Elementary School. Need to research this with properties and existing trails.
P New	Online Comment	22-Jun-19	Sidewalk on Holmes pt drive - it is highly walkable with lots of people parking in summer and a public school bus route it should be safe for kids and walkers

P New	Online Comment	21-Oct-19	Would be great if there was a path going along the waterfront between the north end of the old market street trail and Juanita beach. It would have to go behind the apartment buildings there but maybe it could work like the public pathway around 10th ave S along the water. I think it would just be a lot nicer if the boardwalk was better connected to the beach park with a scenic path.
X-New	Email/Suggest a Project	26-Aug-19	ON NE 135th Street to NE 135th Street West of 87th Avenue NE - Ingrid to show me
X_New	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need pedestrian connection at 132nd from 72nd to 74th
X_New	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	NE 129th Street for pedestrians
X_New	Neigh. Assoc. Mtg - Map Comment	19-Jun-19	Connect 124th Lane NE to 129th Avenue NE
X_New	Email/Suggest a Project	6-Aug-19	Develop a walking trail to connect 129th street to 124th street. This section is wooded and contains right of way for 64th Ave NE. The project could easily be completed with volunteer labor with minimal material cost. The impact would be to substantially increase the walking path options for the Holmes Point neighborhood.
X_New	Email/Suggest a Project	26-Aug-19	From NE 132nd Place to 94th Ave NE - Ingrid to show me
X_New	Email/Suggest a Project	26-Aug-19	From NE 135th Lane to 94th Place NE - Ingrid to show me
X_New	Interest Group Meeting	10-Jun-19	<a href="#">Focus group discussing a proposed emergency access / pedestrian connection along Juanita Heights Park.</a>
Misc	Online Comment	14-Oct-19	The rapid flashing pedestrian crossing of Juanita Drive south of 138th needs to have the trails realigned to orientate with the crossing. There are too many illegal and unsafe crossing occurring here given the trail intersects with Juanita Drive south of the crossing. This should be an immediate priority and should have been completed with the crossing improvement.
Misc	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	My culdesac was supposed to connect to the next culdesac etc when our development was put in. But, instead the easements were just for utilities and fences were put up by homeowners. Winding roads and culdesacs keep kids from walking and biking to school and parks. When developers plan out marking lots of houses a single large property then the city should require them to pu in pedestrian easements along other easements between culdesacs and the roads that go to schools and parks. There needs to be a way to go from 100th Street park in Kirkland all the way to Willows Road. It looks like it is a straight shot.
Misc	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need bike lane from kenmore/Kirkland to Juanita Beach
Misc	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need bus access along NE 132nd Street
Misc	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Roundabout in lieu of lights along Juanita Drive 138th came from 2015 study - better than lights
Misc	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	Need a roundabout at Juanita Drive and NE 138th Pl
General	Online Comment	28-Sep-19	Is a brown line a footpath? I see one on Forbes Creek Road that is going toward Juanita Bay Park and a prime bus connection there. The .4 miles from Parc Provence houses to the Forbes Creek firehouse is unsafe for pedestrians, and especially wheelchairs. We need a sidewalk there, especially since the density keeps climbing. Please make it so we can walk/roll to the lake in relative safety. I sometimes feel trapped because I can't get to Crestwoods Park or downtown without my car. We want to lower the carbon footprint. Make it safe to do so.
General	Online Comment	26-Sep-19	Street grids and connectivity are a good goal. Why not use systems like "walk score" to help quantify the need for connectivity? Like, measure how much walk score goes up by adding connectivity?  All cul de sacs should have a potential connection to "complete a street grid." I'm surprised that the more "twisty cul de sac" parts of Kirkland are not full of blue.  Totem Lake should have exponentially more potential street connections, creating a full street grid that are not "mega-blocks."
General	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	What triggers redevelopment, if a property were to do a short plat or subdivision. If a home is demolished and a new home is built it would trigger frontage improvements, and if were looking for a connection it could be a 20 foot wide of paving for the road (half road improvement) New square footage valued at 117 per foot, if an addition is enough where the value is greater than \$260k, that triggers frontage improvements. Looks to building code to establish improvement value. If a house is redeveloped along an identified connection, the developer is required to do frontage improvements as identified by the City.
General	Email	2-Oct-19	I pretty much restated what I said before in the email below. The only thing missing is that I think there should not be a 2000 sq ft limitation to have homeowners pay for connections. It should only be if the property is subdivided. <b>That is the only other thing I would like to say.</b>
A50	Online Comment	26-Sep-19	I have live on NE 129th st. coming down our street there is a sharp corner at 63rd, that at times during the afternoon the sun is blinding. Putting a road there would add to the safety issues we have driving down 129th st.
A50	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am writing today to share my strong opposition to the proposed street connection (#9) between NE 129th and 130th Pl. I have lived at 12937 63rd Avenue NE for over 15 years. My concerns have to do primarily with safety and preservation of the character and value of the neighborhood The proposed street connection is on a perilously sharp corner on a street (129th) where drivers already have difficulty navigating at a safe speed. The path has a fairly steep gully that would be very expensive to fill and pave. There are five (5) driveways in extremely close proximity to the proposed connection that residents would then have difficulty getting out of. I have middle school aged children that have used the bus stops at the bottoms of NE 129th and NE130th. There are many children (at least 20 at both bus stops combined) that walk up and down 129th and 130th and opening the road connection would make both roads unnecessarily unsafe. Someone from the planning commission needs to come observe exactly how many people walk, bike and use these roads on a daily basis. There is no logic to opening this road in addition to what is already accessible. My neighbors would be losing 10 feet of property each in the proposed street connection- property in their front yards, containing 30 year old rose gardens, and 50+ year old rhododendrons that were planted when farms existed here in the neighborhood. I don't see the value of adding sidewalks in the Holmes Point neighborhood unless it is along Holmes Point Road- which has no shoulders or speed bumps. I am not interested in creating aesthetic uniformity of this neighborhood to other Kirkland neighborhoods. The age, history and close community of this particular neighborhood are what creates value and desirability to live here. I am concerned that the opening of this road will cause serious safety issues, increase noise and cause community distress due to construction and loss of property. There is much development going on on Juanita Drive- far more than the current road infrastructure can handle. It can now take up to a 1/2 hour just to get to the freeway from this neighborhood. I would much rather see resources spent on making Juanita Drive and Holmes Point Drive safer. Paving a community path introducing unnecessary cut through traffic and creating serious safety issues are not reasonable use of resources and will only devalue this neighborhood. Thank you for your consideration in this matter.

A50	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I am impressed by the amount of work you spend for these considerations and grateful for your activity. As Holmes Point / Finn Hill resident, I like the aspect to have better walking access to our wonderful neighborhood. This is certainly an area that most residents will support. Coming originally from Germany where you can walk in practically every forest, I was surprised to see how little interconnection is here between the areas and that is nearly impossible to get to Juanita without using Holmes point. Your plan will change this! However, I have still some remarks and suggestions for 9: As you write, this is a complex topographic area. The county sold several areas of the 64th Ave to neighbors, and at the end of the cul de sac there is frequently used playground that would be in the way. So, each change needs to take into consideration what the neighborhood would gain and loose
A50	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Concerned that this connection will have negative environmental consequences as the steep slope and soft slopes as well as existing trees and stability of the slope. Will be compromised. There is no evidence of community demand or need for this connection.
A50	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Per the comments in the shared connection information, I have concerns about the feasibility of this connection, given the topography, potential for water run-off into residential property and the environmental impact. I also have concerns about the actual need for this (there is pedestrian pathway one cul-de-sac down, and no benefit for emergency services.
A50	Community Meeting - Written Comment	15-Jun-19	Pedestrian connection at tow of undeveloped slope. Concern about environmental impact; runoff, storm drainage with redevelopment
A40	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	Strongly oppose A40, currently a biotope with wildlife and mature trees and needs to be connected. New development east can be accessed from 120th Street. Stop destroying our "green city"
A39	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	Please accept this as a major no against adding A39. Currently there is no cut through to upper Finn Hill and this will open the flood gates. No one has requested this opening. Just look at the East of Market neighborhoods and how traffic cuts through to avoid Market Street. This will have the same impact so people will miss the 5 way stop light at Holmes Point. 80th already has limited sight lines entering Juanita drive and there has been a fatal crash there in the past. This will only serve to increase an already dangerous outflow to Juanita Drive. Please reconsider as if you look at the map it is obvious many on the top of Finn Hill will figure out this new proposed by-pass and will endanger many homes and pedestrians with speeding and increased traffic. Steve Shinstrom
A39	Email to City Council	9-Oct-19	<p>Dear city counsel members,</p> <p>I live on 117th place in Finn Hill and wanted to share why I oppose the future street connection A39.</p> <p>I really see no point making this a through street if all the cars are just going to get dumped onto Juanita Drive. It will just make the area more dangerous.</p> <p>First, this road is very steep and not wide enough. People will just drive up and down the hill very fast since it's so steep. When it snows, not even an all wheel drive can go up the hill. There is a play ground at the bottom of the hill and we have lots of young kids on this street playing outside. Those kids would be in immediate danger because from the playground, the car won't be able to see the kids and vice versa. These kids run up and down the street to/from neighbors' houses, playground, etc. I'm really concerned about their safety.</p> <p>Second, Juanita drive is already saturated to a point where the cars won't even be able to merge on to the lane in the morning. I don't think the small roads are the problem, it's Juanita Drive. Before tackling small roads' connections, how come no one is doing anything about the main problem, "Juanita Drive." All these new homes are being built and we have one main road which only has one narrow lane. During commuting time, sometimes the backup can be from juanita beach all the way to the shell gas station on 123rd St. A39 leads to 80th and then to Juanita drive. This area is not even safe at all. You can't even see the cars driving south on Juanita drvie from 80th. Not a good place to merge on to Juanita dr. It will just cause more accidents.</p> <p>If you visit this area, you will know why we have so many walkers and joggers. Our neighborhood ends with an awesome view of the lake Washington. People come here to enjoy that. Putting a road here would make it impossible for people to do that. Some of the streets don't have sidewalks so people just walk on the road which is pretty safe right now but if we turned this place into busier road, it would be very dangerous.</p> <p>To get to the future road A39, you have to take either 119th St or 117th St. Both streets are not wide enough for 2 lanes plus sidewalks. Also it's curvy and hilly. Couple years ago, my husband got into a car accident on 119th St because there was a trailer parked overnight and he didn't see because of the hill. Lot of walkers and joggers use this road. More cars will come this way if A39 happens and all they want is to get on Juanita Drive.</p> <p>Please come explore our neighborhood before deciding. You will see exactly what I mean. This place is not a place for connecting road. It will ruin the whole atmosphere, Finn Hill's charm and "hidden nature" of this neighborhood. Please don't make it into just any other neighborhood. We should preserve what we have especially when too many houses are being built in Kirkland.</p> <p>Thank you for reading my email.</p>

A39	Online Comment	1-Oct-19	<p>I vehemently oppose connection A39 for the following reasons:  It is at odds with the spirit of street connections as it will destroy the appeal and safety of the area for walkers and cyclists for whom connectivity is required;  by creating a cut through to Juanita Dr. There is no way to ensure the route is only used by local drivers, and it would likely become a busy main arterial route for north and south bound commuters;  The City Plan states that cut throughs are not desirable and should be avoided;  It would divert traffic away from existing traffic control measures i.e. traffic lights;  to a dangerous junction with Juanita Dr where traffic accidents have already occurred;  Homes along the route do not have the same set back as other arterial routes, and many driveways are steeply sloped. This would be a safety concern for families if the speed and volume were that of an arterial route /cut through;  City commissioned traffic studies of Juanita Drive confirmed traffic speeds more-so downhill. A39 routes traffic down a tract of straight steep road (flanked by family homes) where speeding would be a realistic threat to safety;  City staff have admitted traffic calming measures, if provided along the route; might not work;  There are multiple blind spots: hill crests; corners; hidden driveways and emerging pathways; for drivers along the route A39 creates;  New family homes have been built since the original proposal in 2017 with driveways opening onto a blind hill along the route of the cut through A39 creates;  The Fire Department have responded to the city that A39 would not shorten their travel times and as such would not be a route required for their purposes;  Either of two alternative pedestrian/cyclist routes mapped would achieve the desired connection between Finn Hill Crest and Hermosa Vista.</p> <p>Additionally, I protest that this has not been an open and transparent consultation! Because A39 was not included in the connection map provided to the FHNA in May 2019 (there was a pedestrian/cycling connection in its place) those who would be impacted by a vehicular connection were unaware that it would be tabled for discussion and of the need therefore to attend.</p>
A39	Online Comment	30-Sep-19	<p>I live in the Chatham Ridge neighborhood on NE 117th Place. I am disappointed to see that this is on the agenda again as a proposed street connection. We have repeatedly voice our concerns about the safety of our neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods in traffic was allowed to come through.  The streets connecting to NE 117th Place are already dangerous - with many blindspots, steep hills, and tight corners. This area was not made to take a lot of vehicle traffic. The safety of all the pedestrians that use this "loop" is in jeopardy. There is not one day that I don't see at least 10 people walking in our neighborhood loop (84th Ave NE - NE 117th St - 82nd Ave NE - NE 119th St). This is why I love this area - a safe neighborhood that my family can walk around. Isn't that we need in our neighborhoods - adults and kids getting outside and being able to walk safely in their own neighborhood without being worried of some driver cutting through our neighborhood to beat the traffic on Juanita Drive?  Now, the park at the bottom of our cul-da-sac on NE 117th Place is another issue. This is why I moved here! I grew up playing outside in my cul-da-sac and I always imagine my children doing the same. Children playing outside in the safety of their neighborhood park is what our world needs. Children riding bikes, drawing with chalk, just running round the cul-da-sac is what our world needs. Now, you are thinking of taking that away from our neighborhood? That sharp corner will be a huge blindspot for children entering and leaving the park. There is no doubt in my mind that drivers will be racing down the steep hill to that street connection to avoid traffic on Juanita Drive. They will also be racing back up the hill too. I will no longer let me children play outside in the park if this street is approved.  Please take A39 off the table. This route is unsafe and will take away something pretty amazing that we have in this neighborhood - a place to be safe outside without the worry of some car speeding by. Come and take a drive in our neighborhood. You will see all the safety concerns that we have continually voiced to the city council. Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>
A39, A40, T40	Email to City Council	9-Oct-19	<p>I am a resident of Chatham Ridge neighborhood and I have two little kids. We purchased our home in the neighborhood because we liked the quiet streets and lack of traffic-- the safety of our children is #1. My children are 2 and 5 years old. There is a neighborhood park at the bottom of our hill we're you're proposing connections, but that is where my children play. I absolutely would not want any of our kids or other neighborhood children to be affected by car traffic -- it is a hazard and we are prepared to take legal action.</p> <p>Our family and neighbors strongly OPPOSE A39,A40 and T40 connections.</p>
A39, A40, T40	Email	30-Sep-19	<p>I am a homeowner on Finn hill (11717 82and Ave NE) and would like to share my strong opposition to the following vehicle road connections (I am fine with pedestrian).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) A 39  Narrow, steep road that would turn into a dangerous short cut to Juanita drive (that has turned into a parking lot between 7:30am and 8:30, maybe something to consider finding relief for). Last year the Finn hill neighborhoods opposing the plans were told this was going to be pedestrian connection only so very unpleasantly surprised to now this this come back as a potential road in the fine print. We have tons of kids in the neighborhoods with narrow and steep roads, it's a accident in the making. There is no benefit to having this connection, emergency vehicles access is very quick with the new bollards at 120th St.</li> <li>2) A 40  Same as above, would turn into a short cut from and to Juanita Drive and flood the small Finn Hill roads with commuter traffic from people who pay their taxes somewhere else. There is no benefit to having this connection, emergency vehicles access is very quick with the new bollards at 120th St.</li> <li>3) T 40  Currently a beautiful Biotop with nature trees, a walking/bike path and wildlife (see picture). It's comical that we are approving bonds for king county to fund green space and talk about a "green loop" and than bulldoze the few green areas we still have for no good reason. The new (small) development west to the biotope can be accessed from 120th street. The bollards on 120th can be removed for emergency access. There is no reason to waste our precious budgets dollars to destroy Biotops with concrete without a particularly tangible benefit to Kirkland residents.</li> </ol>

A39, T40, A40	Email	30-Sep-19	<p>I live in the Chatham Ridge neighborhood on NE 117th Place. I am disappointed to see that this is on the agenda again as a proposed street connection. We have repeatedly voice our concerns about the safety of our neighborhood and surrounding neighborhoods in traffic was allowed to come through.</p> <p>The streets connecting to NE 117th Place are already dangerous - with many blindspots, steep hills, and tight corners. This area was not made to take a lot of vehicle traffic. The safety of all the pedestrians that use this "loop" is in jeopardy. There is not one day that I don't see at least 10 people walking in our neighborhood loop (84th Ave NE - NE 117th St - 82nd Ave NE - NE 119th St). This is why I love this area - a safe neighborhood that my family can walk around. Isn't that we need in our neighborhoods - adults and kids getting outside and being able to walk safely in their own neighborhood without being worried of some driver cutting through our neighborhood to beat the traffic on Juanita Drive?</p> <p>Now, the park at the bottom of our cul-da-sac on NE 117th Place is another issue. This is why I moved here! I grew up playing outside in my cul-da-sac and I always imagine my children doing the same. Children playing outside in the safety of their neighborhood park is what our world needs. Children riding bikes, drawing with chalk, just running round the cul-da-sac is what our world needs. Now, you are thinking of taking that away from our neighborhood? That sharp corner will be a huge blindspot for children entering and leaving the park. There is no doubt in my mind that drivers will be racing down the steep hill to that street connection to avoid traffic on Juanita Drive. They will also be racing back up the hill too. I will no longer let me children play outside in the park if this street is approved.</p> <p>Please take A39, T40 and A40 off the table. These routes are unsafe and will take away something pretty amazing that we have in this neighborhood - a place to be safe outside without the worry of some car speeding by. Come and take a drive in our neighborhood. You will see all the safety concerns that we have continually voiced to the city council. Thank you for taking the time to read this.</p>
A39	Email	30-Sep-19	<p>I met with you back in 2017 regarding the city's proposal to plan a street connection between NE 117th Pl and 80th Ave NE.</p> <p>The conclusion at that time was that the city would suspend further meetings on the subject and go back to the drawing board to establish exactly why each of the identified connections would actually be desirable.</p> <p>When the city came back to the subject earlier this year, they circulated a revised map in which the connection of our streets had been marked as undesirable due to it having the effect of creating a cut through on to Juanita Drive; cut throughs having been identified, I believe, in the City-wide Plan as something that should be avoided. Instead there were two potential footpath routes mapped to provide the desired connection to the Hermosa Vista neighborhood. The Fire Department had highlighted the few connections which would be of use for them and this was not one of them.</p> <p>In light of the deletion of the proposal to create a full vehicular connection, a significant number of people from our neighborhood chose not to attend the connections working group held earlier this year in order to allow others with concerns about then current proposals chance and indeed space to have their voices heard. For the connection to be added back in, in our absence, appears somewhat underhand.</p> <p>You will no doubt remember that our neighborhood is very fearful of this connection as we believe it would create an attractive cut through likely to be used at speed. We do not feel that it meets the description or spirit of a street connection as it would not provide the benefits of one and would in fact strip the entire area of its appeal to walkers and cyclists.</p> <p>I recall the City commissioning traffic studies on Juanita Drive which identified that traffic breaks speed limits most frequently when going downhill; where on NE 117th Pl we have a steep straight road with a blind spot hiding a play area and a number of family homes with short steep driveways directly onto that road. Further up the hill the roads are not adequate to support multiple lanes of traffic due to tight corners and blind hills in two places (one of which now has the driveway of new homes leading directly onto it). Further down the hill, where the cut through would meet Juanita Drive, is a notoriously difficult junction where traffic accidents have occurred.</p> <p>The City's argument that "your street will be less safe but this will benefit Kirkland as a whole" does not sit well with us. Nor does the idea of paying taxes to add traffic calming measures to roads that would not need them without this connection. We take no comfort in the City's assurances that this will not happen until neighboring property is sold, particularly when we are told one year that the proposal is 'off the table' only to find it has made its way back on the table again. Will we ever be able to take the City at it's word and trust there isn't an intent to force this connection through regardless of public opposition?!</p> <p>Can I ask therefore, if you continue to support us in opposing connection [now labelled] A39 as you did in 2017? Your assistance, in consideration of your back ground of work, would be much appreciated.</p>
A39, T39, T40, P33-36	Email	25-Jun-19	<p>I'd like to support the initiative to open up walkways / pathways for pedestrians - and cars where needed – to make our Neighborhood safer for everyone, whereas foremost for the school children who need these kinds of access.A huge focus is therefor on the section A39 as shown below. Same as T39, T40, and P33-36.</p>

A39 P37	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>Objection to extension of street grid through Juanita Crest Neighborhood and in particular on NE 117th and 119th. My neighbors and I appreciate and support many items in the planning process and improving the street grid is one of those. We also thank you for the opportunities at Public Hearings to present our views and be assured that our concerns would receive a full and reasonable review. We would welcome visits by the planning department personnel and other interested parties to understand our issues. The two most important to many of the residents are: Increased automobile traffic and the risk of accidents and injury to walkers. The area designated as Juanita Crest is among the oldest on the top of Finn Hill. It is located at the south end of 84th street and is a dead end area with a loop taking you back to the north. Several houses were built there in early 1950s'. The neighborhood was one that might have been considered a "development" at that time. Whether the streets were laid out with housing in mind or were just access roads for farming is hard to determine. The design standards for rural roads were much different in the 1950's than they are for city streets today. For instance, far less grading was done, and to a large extent, the roads followed the existing terrain. On the "Juanita Loop" there are a number of streets like this. They do not meet many of the modern standards and safety is to be one of those standards. These streets include the south end of 84th, 117th, 82nd and 119th heading back to the east. They typify those early designs. In just the 4 blocks of the loop the hazards include many spots with substandard and dangerous sight lines, all 4 of the corners have blind spots, some more severe than others, and blind driveways are frequent. It appears that even some of the newer houses have been placed without any concern for existing issues. As a result, the problems have become basically embedded. Even over recent years, promises were made to mitigate some of the issues, but nothing was done. Many more homes have been built with approvals that ignored the problems. Changing the grades today to meet current standards would be challenging and expensive considering the topography and tight quarters. While not optimal, the current streets have been largely adequate as the neighborhood has adapted and adjusted to the conditions. The situation would be radically changed and exacerbated by the increased traffic flow that would surely follow developing a through route along these streets. Safety for pedestrian traffic / Walkers - The Juanita Crest loop is a busy walking corridor on South Finn Hill. Families with their children, young and older couples, dog walkers, and so on. The large traffic volumes that would result from designating this neighborhood as a through street route would cause significant safety issues in these hilly narrow streets. A better application would be to improve the walking trails and improve the views over the lake. More details - Development of 117th and 119th would adversely affect the following: There are several blind intersections along the route, as well as inadequate sight lines and steep hills. Additional traffic would magnify those issues. (continued below)</p>
A39 P37	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>(continued from above) These conditions are not desirable but changing them would be both challenging and expensive. Plans at one time called for mitigation of the hills but a combination of the city and county growth management activity did not resolve these issues and housing was added. Now construction of the new housing has been completed with no steps taken. It would be challenging to now try and rectify these with the configuration of the new houses. Essentially the problems have become embedded in the home construction and the historic street design. Going back now to resolve them would meet considerable resistance and is unfair to the home owners who submitted plans which have been followed. At times home owner design changes were required for building approval and in some cases changes were needed to fit the topography. Specific problem areas identified to date: The blind intersection where 84th crosses 119th is a point of particular concern. The issue is that 84th, after it crests the steep hill between 119th and 121st, drops down a second time after it crosses over 119th, rather sharply. If speed is excessive, there is potential loss of vehicle control. If you are unfamiliar with the double drop in the street, you can find your car getting "air" like a roller coaster. This did happen several years ago. A small Honda filled with graduation night students, crested the double dip hill, went airborne, and hit a tree resulting in at least 1 death. These 2 spots on 84th probably also exceed sight line requirements for normal streets, hills and corners. b. Heading further west on 119th, there is another problem area as the road narrows. Here primary issues are site line as the road drops away steeply. The result is visibility problems for 2 way traffic and blind driveways plus a narrowing street. There is also a mature specimen maple tight to the shoulder and both sides are tree lined. NE 117th has the same issues with blind intersections, steep hills and narrow corners. Both streets have side walk issues too. Important walking route. The streets around the Juanita Crest loop are a favorite walking path on south Finn Hill. Increased traffic would further endanger these pedestrians who enjoy the calm neighborhood and relatively careful traffic of the dead end area. The proposal would result in fewer walking routes, counter to one of the master plan goals. School children also walk along this route. Why not improve the trails and encourage walking. Our Request: Given the unique streets and design problems on the Juanita Loop, all routes for connection routes should avoid this small neighborhood. It is unlikely, given the topography problems, that issues will ever be corrected. To insure that someone with short memories or unfamiliarity won't suggest it again, take it off the List.</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I am a Kirkland resident, and would like to oppose route 24 on fill hill. It's a steep hill and puts dozens of kids that live along the hill at risk of getting hit by speeding cars. There is no upside to this, the downsides are more traffic, poured concrete and destroyed nature. I don't think that is what Kirkland stands for. Please oppose this unnecessary road.</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I've reviewed the June, 2017 memorandum on the subject and would like to express my sincere hope that with respect to one of the street connection proposals, specifically the proposal to link NE 117th St with 80th Ave NE, you will reject this proposed connection. While Kirkland Comprehensive Plan policy that was outlined in the memorandum indicates "Traffic spread over a grid of streets balances and minimizes impacts across the network. Therefore, the fact that new connections may increase traffic volume on some existing streets is not a sufficient reason for rejecting such new connections.", I take exception to such policy. Such a policy is easy to state and quite self-serving to the ultimate objective, but it neglects the real impact that will occur on a daily basis for the residents that live in the area. Over the last 10 years, there has been extensive new home building up on Finn Hill that has resulted in a substantial increase in local traffic. While such a traffic increase is less than desirable as it reduces the previous quiet tone of the neighborhoods, the right of people to develop their land within the bounds of current zoning is certainly a right that I embrace. So, an increase in neighborhood traffic that comes with new homes being built is just the inevitability of the state growth management plan. However, establishing the connectivity between NE 117th St and 80th Ave NE changes the neighborhood roads from just that into an arterial path that will ultimately result in a significant increase in non-neighborhood traffic. Please factor into your decision making the negative impact of increased traffic volume on the surrounding neighborhoods for this specific street connectivity proposal. The local neighborhood streets are essentially at capacity with the increase in traffic directly associated with the new homes that have been built. They will be rendered completely inadequate if you approve the connectivity of NE 117th St and 80th Ave NE. Thank you for your consideration of my concern.</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I attended the meeting this evening but could not stay until my turn in the comments - so I wanted to provide them to you now. First off, thank you for providing insight into each of the routes. This was useful. It was encouraging to hear from Rob directly that the City acknowledged and agreed with the points that our neighborhood has raised for Route #24. Namely but not exhaustive: Roads leading up to this connection are narrow, winding and largely pedestrian. The route would be used as an (undesirable) cut through/by pass to Juanita Dr NE, posing serious safety concerns along the route. Traffic calming measures would likely be ineffective. The intersection of 80th and Juanita Dr, already extremely dangerous, would require significant re-work if part of a cut through. I anticipate strong public in person support in objection to route #24 at the public hearing. Our neighborhood is in favor of pedestrian and cycling connections in place of this vehicular proposal.</p>

A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I understand this item will be on the agenda again this week – I want to re-iterate my view below. I'm writing to voice my objection to proposed connection 24, which forms part of the Finn Hill Future Connections draft. There are a number of factors involved in my objection and I would appreciate understanding from you if these items have already been taken into account, or will be taken into account. I have reviewed the minutes from previous public hearings and meetings and find nothing to support the statement that the residents South of Chatham Ridge want a vehicular connection to allow them to feel more connected. I would like to hear the evidence that supports this in the planning meeting tomorrow. I can guarantee (from conversations and meetings with the area) that the entire Chatham Ridge and surrounding neighborhood are opposed to Route 24 and would like to see the breadth and depth of feedback/opinion that the City feels outweighs this. We have not seen a formal traffic study that focuses on safety and risk of the proposed connection. Prevalence of walkers and cyclists in the area, with some of the streets not having sidewalks, makes turning it into a busier route a dangerous option. The City's plan to interconnect by car as much as possible goes against your plan to encourage walking and cycling – it would seem preferential to continue to open up more pedestrian vs vehicular routes, at least to retain the character of the area. In previous years a barricade was erected on NE 120th St because traffic used it as a cut through to Juanita Dr and this was deemed a safety risk and undesirable. NE 117th Pl is more likely to be used as a cut through to Juanita Dr if the proposed route 24 goes into effect. Your contention that motorists will 'learn' it's not a safe/viable cut through is backward – the priority should be on safety and ensuring a cut through is not created. Irregular road widths, with the roads immediately connecting our neighborhood only being wide enough for one car on the corners. When you reach NE 117th Pl it is a relatively wide, straight road. This would lead to an increase in traffic speed as well as traffic as vehicles enter this stretch having navigated slow moving single lane streets and corners. There is a park sitting at the bottom of NE 117th Pl, and the children are effectively hidden from view as they try and return home from the park. Despite the City's assumption, the likelihood of motorists and GPS directions routing traffic through the neighborhood is high. Especially given the fact that barriers have previously been erected to stop this behavior at arguably less attractive 'cut-through' options (NE 120th St). The junction at the very South of 80th that our road would ultimately lead to would be a dangerous junction, with traffic crossing opposite traffic on Juanita Drive to turn left. The overall feeling and character of Finn Hill as a whole would be changed, given a high proportion of the streets are dead end streets off arterials. Thank you for your time</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>As per preparation for next meeting on September 28th to planing the new routes in Finn Hill area, allow me to submit one more time the letter from my family and Chatham Ridge Community with objections to build route #24 due to security and safety reasons of families that are living at Chatham Ridge and close by streets at Finn Hill communities. Beside enclosed reasons mentioned in letters below from August 23 and July 27, allow me to attach the photo of 80th ave ne that we had presented at last city's meeting. As it shown the 80th ave ne road is only 16 ft wide and can't be extended due to private properties borders. Pic. 1. 80th ave ne, north end, not wide enough to pass 2 cars. I won't be repeating the other problematic streets presentations that will become extremely dangerous for pedestrians and cars if path through traffic will start to cut Juanita drive through 80th ave ne and ne 117th pl. As per many letters from community at ne 119th street please look at following problems for safety: 1. crossing of 84th ave NE and ne 119th street at most as due to stiff hill and very narrow road there is not possible to see cars coming south from 84th ave ne 2. ne 117th street and ne 119th street and 82 ave ne and ne 117th pl do not have sufficient room to build safe pedestrians and cars passes 3. when cars parked on the street at ne 117th pl and 82 ave ne and 119th street - it won't be enough room even one car to go in between parked ones, not mentioning lack of pedestrian walk paths. kindly appreciate city will be taken into consideration all our letters and will cancel plan to build ROUTE 24 at finn hill.</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I live on 117th place and wanted to share why I oppose the future road 24. 1. If you visit this area, you will know why we have so many walkers and joggers. Our neighborhood ends with an awesome view of the lake Washington. People come here to enjoy that. Putting a road here would make it impossible for people to do that. Some of the streets don't have sidewalks so people just walk on the road which is pretty safe right now but if we turned this place into busier road, it would be very dangerous. 2. Irregular road widths, with the roads immediately connecting our neighborhood only being wide enough for one car on the corners. To get to the future road "24", you have to take either 119th st or 117th st. Both streets are not wide enough for 2 lanes plus side walks. Also it's curvy and hilly. To turn the corners on 117th st, you practically have to stop to make a sharp right and then it meets the steep hill. On 119th st, this is where my husband recently got into an accident because the road was just too narrow. This road is also very dark and steep. 3. When you reach NE 117th Pl, it's literally more than 45 degrees hill. When it snow, not even an all wheel drive can get up. Sometime people use this place to turn around and those people would either speed down or speed up. My friends and families almost got into an accident with those people trying to get out of this street. I can't imagine what it would be like if this 117th Pl turns into a connecting road. This hill will cause lot of fast driving for sure. I don't think it's wide enough for 2 lanes plus side walks plus car parking. At the end of 117th pl, at the bottom of the hill, there's a play ground for kids. Those kids playing would be in immediate danger because from the playground, the car won't be able to see the kids and vice versa. 4. On 120th, the road was connected before. However it's blocked now and I heard it's due to steep hill and narrow road. I believe 117th Pl is steeper. Please come visit our neighborhood before deciding. You will see exactly what I mean. This place is not a place for connecting road. It will ruin the whole atmosphere. Thank you for reading my email.</p>
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	<p>I listened with interest to the Commissioning Meeting of September 14th where the proposed street connections were discussed. I was pleased to hear Rob Jammerman echo some of the concerns raised by the neighborhood (and in my previous email, below) to connection 24; he described: the narrow and circuitous roads leading into the route would be challenging [where] it may not be desirable to add a lot of traffic [it being] the most vulnerable of all the proposed routes to cut through traffic wishing to avoid Juanita Drive [how] there is a question of [whether] traffic calming measures would be effective or not topography, sight issues and other issues at the intersection of 80th Ave NE definitely requiring improvements for it to be made a connection. For these reasons Rob suggested the connection could be left on the map or alternatively cited for pedestrian and bikes only. N.B. it is worth noting at this point that there is a walking/cycling right of way running parallel to 117th Pl which is currently blocked, which joins the neighborhoods concerned [was marked on the revised connections map taken to the meeting of 9/14]. The decision was made during the meeting to leave the connection on the map and take it to public consultation. For the following reasons I disagree and request it be removed from the map forthwith: City staff have failed to acknowledge or address the safety concerns raised by the public regarding this route [with the exception of Rob Jammerman acknowledging that traffic calming may not be effective] and more importantly has omitted to name public safety as a priority in its decision making. This is eroding public confidence in the decision makers and the process they follow. Given the strength and the nature of objections we have heard from the public and echoed by Rob Jammerman, no further public feedback could be of greater value and override it. The city is keen to stress that the connection would only be made with development of adjacent lots. The public do understand the process, as it was described in the 9/14 meeting, and that the purpose of the inclusion of connections in the Neighborhood Plan is to prevent protracted appeals at the time of development. But the issue of timing is of limited relevance to families living along the proposed connection given that the character and safety of their streets is threatened to such a degree, and this cloud of threat remains until such time it is carried out. Keeping this connection on the map is creating real fear and upset within the neighborhood; if there is agreement that the connection should be struck off the map then continuation of this process regarding connection 24 serves only to continue the distress to the neighborhood. With thanks for your consideration</p>

A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I have sent several emails expressing my views on the Finn Hill, I have even come to one meeting to speak. I would like to reinforce my views before your meeting tomorrow night. The street connection at 80th and 117th should be eliminated for the reason it does not meet neighborhood collection road standards due to an 18 foot pavement form the Artoush short plat to 80th ave NE, dangerous intersection at 80th and Juanita Drive, and no one in the neighborhood wants it. Not the folks on 82nd and 84th, nor the folks on 80th. A development moratorium should be put in place for all of Finn Hill until the plan can be implemented. Traffic on Juanita Drive is already a mess and the amount of new development will make it worse with nor plan to fix it. There are no penalties for developers not following the rules. Trees and steep slopes are being compromised and the City taxpayers will after the two year maintenance bond because many times it takes longer for problems to arise. The HPO should be extend for all sensitive areas or areas next sensitive areas or open spaces to preserve the integrity of the neighborhood. Restriction just in sensitive areas do not take into account the impact of development that may be going on right next to them. Since the construction of Chatam Ridge the Juanita Woodlands has seen new wet areas that has caused more trees to come down on Juanita Drive, and yet areas around the woodlands are not in the HPO even though they will cause downhill destruction to sensitive areas. Thus the reasoning for the moratorium on all of Finn Hill.
A39	Finn Hill Neighborhood Planning Process	Prior to January 2019	I would like to express my opposition to route 24. This is a steep and narrow road with very little visibility. Dozens of small kids live in the neighborhood, it's an accident waiting to happen. Also, drivers will start using it as a short cut to avoid the significant back ups on Juanita Drive, which is not what I think the planers envision for Finn Hill. Plus the road creates more traffic and seals more space, all in contrary to Kirklands reputation as "green city". And what's the benefit? None. A lot of downsides with no benefits. Please oppose this route and focus on important things such as extending the light rail from Bellevue to Kirkland so we don't have to drive to work...
A39	Email	17-Jun-19	Given what the map notes about this not being that essential to the fire department I'm not personally in favor of this connection given the fact it would likely attract a lot of traffic through what is a very dicey intersection between 80 <sup>th</sup> and Juanita Drive.
A39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	A39 Trail- would like to use this trail. Those who live in Hermosa vista, there is a fenced trail in the middle the connects bottom and top. City of Kirkland comes to clean, but it's not necessary, as there isn't a garbage issue.
A39	Community Meeting	15-Jun-19	A39 goes through her house. Why would you need A39, P37, P35? If you built steps on P35 you wouldn't need the others.
A39	Email	5-Oct-19	I live on 117th place in Finn Hill and wanted to share why I oppose the future street connection A39. I really see no point making this a through street if all the cars are just going to get dumped onto Juanita Drive. It will just make the area more dangerous. First, this road is very steep and not wide enough. People will just drive up and down the hill very fast since it's so steep. When it snows, not even an all wheel drive can go up the hill. There is a play ground at the bottom of the hill and we have lots of young kids on this street playing outside. Those kids would be in immediate danger because from the playground, the car won't be able to see the kids and vice versa. These kids run up and down the street to/from neighbors' houses, playground, etc. I'm really concerned about their safety. Second, Juanita drive is already saturated to a point where the cars won't even be able to merge on to the lane in the morning. I don't think the small roads are the problem, it's Juanita Drive. Before tackling small roads' connections, how come no one is doing anything about the main problem, "Juanita Drive." All these new homes are being built and we have one main road which only has one narrow lane. During commuting time, sometimes the backup can be from Juanita beach all the way to the shell gas station on 123rd St. A39 leads to 80th and then to Juanita drive. This area is not even safe at all. You can't even see the cars driving south on Juanita drive from 80th. Not a good place to merge on to Juanita dr. It will just cause more accidents. If you visit this area, you will know why we have so many walkers and joggers. Our neighborhood ends with an awesome view of the lake Washington. People come here to enjoy that. Putting a road here would make it impossible for people to do that. Some of the streets don't have sidewalks so people just walk on the road which is pretty safe right now but if we turned this place into busier road, it would be very dangerous. To get to the future road A39, you have to take either 119th St or 117th St. Both streets are not wide enough for 2 lanes plus sidewalks. Also it's curvy and hilly. Couple years ago, my husband got into a car accident on 119th St because there was a trailer parked overnight and he didn't see because of the hill. Lot of walkers and joggers use this road. More cars will come this way if A39 happens and all they want is to get on Juanita Drive. Please come explore our neighborhood before deciding. You will see exactly what I mean. This place is not a place for connecting road. It will ruin the whole atmosphere, Finn Hill's charm and "hidden nature" of this neighborhood. Please don't make it into just any other neighborhood. We should preserve what we have especially when too many houses are being built in Kirkland. Thank you for reading my email.
A39	Online Comment	23-Oct-19	I am writing to you to express my strong objection to potential road work connection A39 which I understand you are discussing/voting on tomorrow evening.  Specific reasons why I object to connection A39 -The reflow of traffic would create a hazard to Juanita Drive cyclists and pedestrians due to increased "cross-over" traffic on the existing bike path. -It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map -Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; earlier consultations recorded a desire for the restoration of a [now obstructed] former walking connection between Hermosa Vista neighborhood and schools -Neighborhood connectivity can be achieved through mapped pedestrian/cycling connections -A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods -The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding -The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development -Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents -City staff stated on public record traffic calming measures if added may not work -Finn Hill residents have stated that they wish to maintain the character of their area. The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low

A39	Online Comment	10-Oct-19	I oppose the creation connection A39. Increasing traffic through residential neighborhoods to change traffic patterns on Juanita Drive is band-aid that lowers the quality of life for the neighborhood residents and does very little to actually improve the traffic problem. It also presents a significant safety issue, because commuters looking for a short cut are unlikely to abide by speed limits and be as cautious as the residents when driving through the neighborhood. Increasing the number of lanes on Juanita drive is the only realistic SOLUTION to the traffic problem.
A39	Online Comment	12-Oct-19	I am a resident of Hermosa Vista neighborhood and do not want a vehicular connection in the A39 area. I am supportive only of a pedestrian connection
A39, A40, T40	Email	5-Oct-19	I am a resident of Chatham Ridge neighborhood and I have two little kids. We purchased our home in the neighborhood because we liked the quiet streets and lack of traffic-- the safety of our children is #1. My children are 2 and 5 years old. There is a neighborhood park at the bottom of our hill we're you're proposing connections, but that is where my children play. I absolutely would not want any of our kids or other neighborhood children to be affected by car traffic -- it is a hazard and we are prepared to take legal action.  Our family and neighbors strongly OPPOSE A39,A40 and T40 connections.
A39, A40, T40	Email	7-Oct-19	I am a Finn Hill resident and would like to raise my objections and concerns about the proposed connection A39, A40 and T40. I really wish our voice is taken seriously this time (since we have worked hard on the same issue back in 2017). Appreciate your time and consideration! Back in 2017 our neighborhood worked together to oppose the proposed street connection between NE 117th Pl and 80th Ave NE which would create an arterial route to Juanita Drive through our neighborhood. Although it was temporarily removed from the map of proposed connections, this issue is now back before the city for approval without informing us ( In May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route), and is currently referred to as A39. I would like to restate the reasons why we object A39: -It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map -Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low A39 indicates huge safety risks! -A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods. The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding - especially on rainy and snowy days. In Feb of this year, there were already several accidents and injuries along the roads. -Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents Similarly, due to safety and road nature concerns, i also object A40 and T40.
A39	Email	7-Oct-19	I am writing to oppose street connection A39 for the following reasons:  -It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map -Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; earlier consultations recorded a desire for the restoration of a [now obstructed] former walking connection between Hermosa Vista neighborhood and schools -Neighborhood connectivity can be achieved through mapped pedestrian/cycling connections -A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods -The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding -The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development -Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents -City staff stated on public record traffic calming measures if added may not work -Finn Hill residents have stated that they wish to maintain the character of their area. The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low As a side point, it's worth noting that back in May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route, but as a pedestrian/cycle connection only. Because of this opponents of a vehicular connection were unaware that was in fact tabled and missed that opportunity to raise objections.

A39, A40, T40	Email	7-Oct-19	<p>I am a Finn Hill resident and would like to raise my objections and concerns about the proposed connection A39, A40 and T40. I really wish our voice is taken seriously this time (since we have worked hard on the same issue back in 2017). Appreciate your time and consideration!</p> <p>Back in 2017 our neighborhood worked together to oppose the proposed street connection between NE 117th Pl and 80th Ave NE which would create an arterial route to Juanita Drive through our neighborhood.</p> <p>Although it was temporarily removed from the map of proposed connections, this issue is now back before the city for approval without informing us ( In May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route), and is currently referred to as A39.</p> <p>I would like to restate the reasons why we object A39:  It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map  Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low A39 indicates huge safety risks!  A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods. The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding - especially on rainy and snowy days. In Feb of this year, there were already several accidents and injuries along the roads.  Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents  Similarly, due to safety and road nature concerns, i also object A40 and T40.</p>
A39	Email	8-Oct-19	<p>I'm writing to inform you that I am vehemently opposed to a vehicular connection referred to as A39. I agree 100% with Kathy Brown's reasons why I object to connections A39.</p> <p>Some statistics she failed to mention were how many kids play in the streets in neighborhoods of Hermosa Vista, Timberlake, and the surrounding neighborhoods. There are over 240 homes in those neighborhoods with over 200 kids under the age of 18. None of these families and children have a safe access to a public park. I know I've been trying for over 9 years to create a park within the community (in the island on 81st Ave.) I was told by the city that would be unsafe for the kids. Yet, currently the kids play in the street with their neighbors. I've also been trying for over 9 years to get pedestrian access at the proposed connection. NOT a vehicular path. I'd also like safe access to Juanita Beach.</p> <p>But right now, to get out of the neighborhood we have to exit onto Juanita Drive. We have 4 choices. Based on your Juanita Drive Corridor Study: Each one of those intersections rate as "severe or challenging Collision Hot Spots." The study also mentions there have been 2 fatalities, 9 injuries, and 28 total accidents leaving our neighborhood from those intersections. If you create a vehicular cut through, those numbers will increase drastically.</p> <p>Another statistic no one has mentioned is how long it takes to leave our neighborhood. When I moved to this area over 15 years ago, I did not have much trouble merging onto Juanita drive. Now it can take a few minutes to even safely merge and when you do you have to floor it for fear of getting hit. If more people cut through our neighborhood, it will take even longer to exit our neighborhood.</p> <p>Lastly, I don't see how you can even feasibly make a street connection. There isn't enough room to create a two lane road. The pathway is 20 feet wide. You'd have to bulldoze some houses.</p> <p>I do NOT want a road connection at 80th Ave NE to NE 117th Pl.</p>
A39	Email	8-Oct-19	<p>I am a lifelong Finn Hill resident. My great grandparents were the first to build on the hill and since they were from Finland, its why it is called Finn Hill today. I strongly oppose the road/walkway being added as A39. This is a residential dead end neighborhood with tons of family walking along the roads without many sidewalks. Kids ride their bikes back and forth. Its rural and safe and we do not need to build another roadway up from Juanita Drive to the narrow, many driveways, of the end of 84th Ave NE. Also, having more cars come up and down from Juanita Drive on 80th Ave NE is also unsafe. There have been many accidents there already...don't want to increase the chance of more of them. Apparently the city has studied this option and concluded that calming measures on the road will not work. No resident up here has requested adding a through route so simply because of that it should not even be considered but needs to be tabled.</p>

A39	Email	9-Oct-19	<p>I would like to join my neighbors in voicing my concerns and objections to connection A39. I am very concerned about any additional traffic brought to the area as the roads around the neighborhood are very narrow with several blind corners, lack sidewalks and not conducive to increased traffic. Increased traffic through the neighborhood would cause increased congestion and introduce additional risk for accidents.</p> <p>If you have not yet walked around our neighborhood (Finn Hill, Chatham Ridge), I invite and encourage you to do so as I hope and believe it will give you an idea of the challenges A39 would cause.</p> <p>I am sure you have already seen our list of reasons in other emails, but for reference I am attaching them again.</p> <p>I thank you in advance for your consideration.</p> <p>Some reasons why we object to connection A39</p> <p>It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map</p> <p>Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; earlier consultations recorded a desire for the restoration of a [now obstructed] former walking connection between Hermosa Vista neighborhood and schools</p> <p>Neighborhood connectivity can be achieved through mapped pedestrian/cycling connections</p> <p>A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods</p> <p>The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding</p> <p>The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development</p> <p>Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents</p> <p>City staff stated on public record traffic calming measures if added may not work</p> <p>Finn Hill residents have stated that they wish to maintain the character of their area. The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low</p> <p>As a side point, it's worth noting that back in May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route, but as a pedestrian/cycle connection only. Because of this opponents of a vehicular connection were unaware that was in fact tabled and missed that opportunity to raise objections.</p>
A39, A40	Online Comment	7-Oct-19	<p>I am opposed to A39 and A40. Back in 2017 we worked together to oppose the proposed street connection between NE 117th Pl and 80th Ave NE which would create an arterial route to Juanita Drive through our neighborhood. Although it was temporarily removed from the map of proposed connections, this issue is now back before the city for approval, and is currently referred to as A39. back in May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route, but as a pedestrian/cycle connection only. Because of this opponents of a vehicular connection were unaware that was in fact tabled and missed that opportunity to raise objections.</p> <p>Please stop playing with us, our voice matters!</p>
A39	Online Comment	7-Oct-19	<p>A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods</p> <p>The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding</p> <p>Finn Hill residents have stated that they wish to maintain the character of their area. The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low .</p> <p>A39 indicates huge risks for kids/walkers.</p> <p>Whenever it rains or snows, this connection will become a terrible hazard. During the snow days in Jan-Feb 2019, there were already several accidents/injuries.</p>

A39	Online Comment	7-Oct-19	<p>I would like to oppose A39 for the following reasons:</p> <p>It wouldn't improve access for the Fire Department - this was confirmed on record and is reflected in the current iteration of the map</p> <p>Residents haven't requested vehicular connection on this route; earlier consultations recorded a desire for the restoration of a [now obstructed] former walking connection between Hermosa Vista neighborhood and schools</p> <p>Neighborhood connectivity can be achieved through mapped pedestrian/cycling connections</p> <p>A39 would enable and encourage regional, bypass and cut through traffic and speeding in residential neighborhoods</p> <p>The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding</p> <p>The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development</p> <p>Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents</p> <p>City staff stated on public record traffic calming measures if added may not work</p> <p>Finn Hill residents have stated that they wish to maintain the character of their area. The area along the A39 route is particularly unique as it is used by a large volume of walkers and cyclists, partly because traffic volume is low</p> <p>As a side point, it's worth noting that back in May of this year the city provided stakeholders with a map of proposed connections in advance of holding the open house consultation. Route A39 was not included on that map as a vehicular route, but as a pedestrian/cycle connection only. Because of this opponents of a vehicular connection were unaware that was in fact tabled and missed that opportunity to raise objections.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>The proposed route on A39 should ONLY be a pedestrian path, not a road. A road would increase cut through traffic and risk for residents, while not improving safety for anyone. A pedestrian path on the other hand, would increase safe walking areas for the many young residents of Hermosa Vista who have to avoid Juanita Drive due to the lack of safe pedestrian walking path there.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>A39 should be on the map as a potential pedestrian connection. If A39 is created as a street connection it would fundamentally change the character of quiet neighborhoods, put traffic through narrow streets with poor visibility and no traffic controls. Please remove A39 as a potential street connection. Thank you!</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>I am opposed to this connection. It will create high volume traffic through very narrow streets with sharp, steep, blind corners. These streets currently have very heavy walking, running, cycling traffic which adds to the potential danger of increased traffic.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>Please reconsider this. Juanita Pkwy is a complete nightmare because Kirkland cannot say no to development. It's now difficult to enter Juanita Drive from our streets. Road rage is causing accidents.</p> <p>Kirkland has allowed more construction in our area which adds 40 more cars. If you decide to connect streets, we're just adding another way to add more cars to our streets, with minimal access to Juanita Drive. Our area which was safe for kids to ride bikes, will now be an access to speeding cars frustrated of Juanita Drive &amp; looking for ways around it. STOP BUILDING IN KIRKLAND! The infrastructure of our streets /transportation is not made for more houses. The day we have a true emergency will be left for all council to deal with.</p> <p>Instead of a street connection, at least provide pedestrian access to our neighborhood. We then would have full access for our kids to walk to school.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>A39 on Finn Hill near the south end of 84th Ave NE</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>I am writing to oppose the proposed street connection between NE 117th Pl and 80th Ave NE. This neighborhood is a safe place for dozens of young neighborhood children who enjoy the ability to play in our surrounding area without the threat of traffic, speeding cars, and distracted drivers trying to weave their way in and out of our area. There are numerous blind spots on hills and corners which present a huge risk of pedestrians being struck by through traffic. This connection has not been requested by any of the residents in this area, and we are strongly opposed to this connection. The number of driveways on to this proposed route far exceeds that of other arterial routes due to the density of the development</p> <p>Creation of this cut through would lead more traffic to the junction of 80th, a junction with poor visibility and a history of traffic accidents. The nature of the roads along the route: circuitous, narrow/varying widths; blind corners and hills; straight steep sections would likely lead to speeding. I understand that city council is always trying to juggle the many demand of residents and public, but I beg of anyone reading this to realize that this connection truly is the wrong decision.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>Do not create vehicular connection between Hermosa Vista and Chatham Ridge. It would add significant traffic to our exits to Juanita Dr. Already complicated entry/exit to/from the Neighborhood will be much more complicated. I'm not even talking about safety issues because of increased traffic inside the neighborhood caused by people who are lost or who are looking for another shortcuts.</p>
A39	Online Comment	8-Oct-19	<p>I do NOT want a street connection. However I do want a pedestrian connection.</p>