

## K2044 Comprehensive Plan Public Comments Received 2022 - October 10, 2024

<b>General Public Comments</b>		
Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2023	Building Code	I realize Kirkland will be changing a great deal as 2044 draws nearer. I would like to have a uniform LOOK for Kirkland in building code exterior. I prefer white or nearly white exterior colors on all downtown buildings. Similar to Greece. This could include a theme or perhaps not. Edmonds downtown has a brick appearance and looks great. White would look great from the lake and also the freeway. We could perhaps incorporate a seaport theme. The tan color of the Port Smith could fit in but I prefer lighter.
	Building Code - ACUs	Legalize small accessory commercial units (ACUs) throughout city including residential areas; reduce office costs for non-profits
12/23/2023	Building Code - smoking areas	Require developers to include a designated smoking area within a housing or business development. It could include seating, trash receptacles, disposal urns for cigarette butts. It is a practical approach to this conflict between nonsmoker's rights and smoker's rights. I hope the city will look at developing a similar policy for businesses to follow.
	Building Code - Sustainability	Reduce barriers to sustainable development; relax height and other building requirements for LEED Platinum or passive house standards
2/10/2023	Building Code/Affordable Housing	Aaron Jacobson with Liveable Kirkland, Eastside For All, Futurewise, Habitat for Humanity Seattle-King & Kittitas Counties, Joan McBride, Kirkland Greenways, Mark Vossler, MD. Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility, Representative Amy Walen, Representative Davina Duerr, Representative Roger Goodman, Sightline Institute For an Affordable, Sustainable Kirkland study following policies for update: - Increase height limits, reduce floor area ratio caps, setback & stepback requirements, lot coverage limits, density limits, and other building restrictions. Reduce permit processes. - Preserve existing affordable multifamily housing. Exempt 100% affordable housing from zoning requirements
4/19/2022	Building Code/Parking Standards	Allow 4-8 unit buildings in all zones; single stair buildings; HB 1099; Incentivize mass timber structures; reduce parking standards;
8/20/2024	Children and Safety	I'm not an expert in parenting, but I try my best to learn and frequently chat with child experts: pediatricians, child psychologists and daycare teachers. I see many of the teachers take the bus from far away so I empathize deeply. With that, the Comp Plan has no mention of any benefits for the 20,000+ children in Kirkland! The Comp plan should be a grand vision to make this an even better place for all our kids (that's why many of us moved here). My second ask is for the Lake Washington School District and Allegro Pediatrics to write a section on what they think the ideal state of the city should be for the children - you will easily get the support of all parents in Kirkland if this were on the top of the plan, especially if you include concrete details to decrease crime across the city.
5/13/2024	Communication/Outreach	-What is the purpose of public comment at a Comprehensive Plan public hearing if public comments are not discussed nor addressed during the hearing. -Is it too much to ask for commissioners to understand, discuss, and act on public comments presented that evening? -Maybe you should ask the public to submit written comments one week prior, to enable commissioners to digest them? In that case, the packet would need to be released at least 2 weeks prior to the hearing and you would need to advertise that verbal comments at the hearing should either be very simple to address or be just highlights of comments submitted earlier. -I strongly recommend addressing this question before the May 23rd public hearing. -Is the public supposed to feel that their comments have been heard and addressed, or is the public supposed to hear "thank you for your comments" and then feel like their efforts were merely whistling into the wind? It really should be the former! How do we make that happen? -A small percentage of Kirklanders have been engaged throughout the update process, too. However, much of the public has not had a chance to review the materials until now.
	Community	This is a very beautiful city and am currently looking for employment that will keep me in this sophisticated and welcoming community. I get a sense of "home" here! City residents are warm and friendly and very inviting.
6/13/2023	Comunication/Outreach	Suggestions for additional ways to reach people: digital reader boards at Marina Park, sign on 85th going towards downtown, canvas banners on Lake Street, canvassing neighborhoods with fliers, Kirkland Magazines, table at existing community events, table at farmer's markets, more printed materials, fliers at bookstores, catalogs and mailers, advertise on buses.
6/13/2023	Comunication/Outreach	Suggestions related to how the City can better reach renters. Mailers and fliers, targeting specific apartment buildings. Canvas neighborhoods/buildings and actually speak with people, have a mini town hall at an apartment building so residents don't have to go to another location, have events at the library and affordable housing properties, accomodate renter's schedules and offer events over the weekends instead of during the work week, advertise on buses.
6/13/2023	Comunication/Outreach	City should consider a public, virtual community bulletin board on the City website.
5/22/2024	Comunication/Outreach	Requests and recommends that the public hearing on the Draft 2044 Comp Plan scheduled for Thursday May 23, 2024 be rescheduled. In the alternative, May 23rd should not be the only hearing for the land use, sustainability climate & environment, human services, neighborhood plan updates, and community amendment requests. There should be at least two additional public hearings on just these elements scheduled. There is a lot of information to digest in those 5 elements which were only made available for the public's review less than 2 weeks ago. There are very significant changes being proposed. There needs to be substantial public advertising and notifications about these proposed changes. I do not beleive there has been sufficient notification to residents about these proposed changes and the hearing. Also, there are mistakes, a lack of clarity, and unreadable portions in the materials that were posted as the official packet for the hearing. Although I and others have reached out to obtain clarification or versions that are legible, those have not been made available to the entire public to date.
	Comunication/Outreach	Track demographics of who is providing input with each engagement method by census data

## General Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/25/2024	Development Regulations	<p>pg 473 P N 25</p> <p>In addition to "Landscape buffers": Establish minimum setbacks of 7.5 feet on both sides of build mass, AND incorporate EITHER daylight plane standards (roof pitch of 45 degrees beginning 10 feet above grade at the property line) OR establish a minimum five-foot second-story step-back. (Allowing both permeability and light for the neighboring structure) (For more info see Bellevue guidelines - FAR single family): <a href="https://eur04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fbellevuewa.gov%2Fcity-government%2Fdepartments%2Fdevelopment%2Fzoning-and-land-use%2Fzoning-requirements%2Ffloor-area-ratio&amp;data=02%7C01%7C%7Cd830c483b1c7454c297f08d76859e936%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637092607683047799&amp;sdata=KYExiEWkrZljXazZ%2FU%2BQshQ9RmVPSdHwz3%2BUpoLq8KQ%3D&amp;reserved=0">https://eur04.safelinks.protection.outlook.com/?url=https%3A%2F%2Fbellevuewa.gov%2Fcity-government%2Fdepartments%2Fdevelopment%2Fzoning-and-land-use%2Fzoning-requirements%2Ffloor-area-ratio&amp;data=02%7C01%7C%7Cd830c483b1c7454c297f08d76859e936%7C84df9e7fe9f640afb435aaaaaaaaaaaa%7C1%7C0%7C637092607683047799&amp;sdata=KYExiEWkrZljXazZ%2FU%2BQshQ9RmVPSdHwz3%2BUpoLq8KQ%3D&amp;reserved=0</a></p> <p>Pg 402 N-9</p> <p>"regulated" - Why are significant trees removed. In a time of climate concern, large significant healthy trees should remain, especially those on property edges. <del>They are irreplaceable and construction would curve around to allow permeable area and walk-way</del></p>
9/27/2024	General	<p>I'm following up to share the speech I delivered at the September 17 Council meeting, along with links to environmental studies from other cities that relate to their comprehensive planning efforts. I hope these resources provide valuable context for your ongoing discussions and help inform a balanced approach to how our community can grow responsibly while remaining a welcoming place for all. I'm a voting resident of Kirkland. I also work in local government and believe deeply in responsible, data-driven growth.</p> <p>For years, Washington cities have taken a thoughtful approach to meeting state-mandated growth requirements. They've provided their communities and elected officials with multiple alternatives, citing (SEPA), which requires a "no action" option and at least two reasonable growth alternatives. These cities allowed time for public input, data analysis, and careful discussion—ultimately many produced hybrid growth plans that took the best of several approaches. Bellevue studied four growth alternatives and arrived at a fifth preferred option over a year ago. Redmond engaged its community in 2020 and chose three alternatives before selecting a preferred approach. Seattle reviewed four scenarios before choosing a fifth, combined option. Kent, Bothell, and Auburn all presented a minimum of three options.</p> <p>And yet, here in Kirkland, we've only seen one growth alternative above the no-change option. One alternative. We've been given minimal time to react and collaborate on a better, hybrid solution. Unlike our neighbors, we have been left scrambling to understand a plan that is insufficient without the necessary data or dialogue.</p> <p>This process has left much of the community feeling confused, frustrated, and excluded—especially single-family homeowners, who have been unfairly targeted to bear the brunt of this growth. One Planning Commissioner even compared this plan to a "Hunger Games of the Neighborhoods." And while I laughed at the remark, the truth is, I am one of the tributes.</p> <p>But something extraordinary has also happened. Out of this unnecessary division, confusion, and tension, neighbors have come together with a strong and unified voice. We've chosen to engage, and now we are standing at your door and we are asking you not to turn your backs on us.</p> <p>Create a growth plan that prioritizes development in the 85th Street Corridor and the growth centers, revitalizes old neighborhood strip malls into vibrant neighborhood centers with clear boundaries, and continues supporting the missing middle housing legislation already taking shape in our neighborhoods. I've heard it said that this current plan is bold. I don't see bold. I see an incomplete plan—one that lacks depth, data, research, and options. We, the people of Kirkland, who have invested in this city for years, and invested in you, are asking you to be bold.</p> <p>Create a plan that doesn't divide our community. A plan that lifts Kirkland as a whole, and reflects our values, and unites us around a shared vision. That's the legacy you should be striving for, not a divisive growth strategy that will be remembered with regret.</p>
9/7/2024	General	2044 plan needs to be revised!

## General Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/14/2024	General	<p>Q2: Besides using the internet, how can the City do a better job of reaching people to share information? (For example, mailings, radio, newspapers, posting on bulletin boards, having open house sessions, translating materials and having interpretation available) Honestly, I don't know. Maybe we could ask the help of groups associated with the targeted (marginalized) communities: the Iman center posts notices in the mosque; the senior center sends out emails; etc.</p> <p>Q3: How can the City better reach renters? How can the City get more renters engaged in civic processes? Target/via the community college and buses.</p> <p>Q4: Which areas (locations) are most impacted by transportation concerns? Which types of services do people have difficulty accessing due to inadequate public transportation? What are your ideas to address transportation concerns? The areas with the least bus access are most impacted. Buses are a catch-22, I realize. Routes don't work without riders, but riders won't move into areas without routes. This encourages economically-segregated neighborhoods.</p> <p>Q5: To meet basic needs, which types of services or uses should be paired with affordable housing or permanent supportive housing? (For example, behavioral &amp; mental health services, day cares, grocery stores, community space) As someone who has supervised clinical staff in PSH and worked within public housing, I can speak to this directly. First, healthcare services. This includes primary care and behavioral healthcare. Both are very important. Case management services are vital, as well. Food banks are very important to such residents, as well.</p> <p>Q6: What kinds of job training/skill training/access to higher education would be useful? I teach at the local community college: LWTech. We have affordable adult education: bachelors degrees, associate degrees, certificates, ELL, high school completion, basic adult education... Few folks know about us, however. We do good work. We have good results. And we're ready to bring people in.</p> <p>Q7: How can the City support services like public restrooms and showers? Make them &amp; clean them often! Yes, we need public facilities!</p>
7/8/2024	General	<p>My wife and I are formerly expressing our grave concerns with the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. We do not remotely support such a ludicrous plan that would outright destroy the fabric of our community.</p>
1/4/2023	Parking Standards	<p>Comments summarized: Supports the city taking aggressive action on zoning changes to remove minimum parking requirements for developers across all of Kirkland. The current commitment locks us into a pattern we need to break - enabling car use which deters more progressive mass transit, and making a poor use of real estate that can be used for other purposes like more housing and businesses.</p> <p>These benefits would result of the changes: Aging population - promotes density so mobility-challenged can get more easily to the resources they need within a smaller radius of their home. Inclusion/diversity &amp; multi-family housing demand - creates more space for affordable housing by repurposing parking lots to housing. Climate change - puts a real burden on drivers to stop driving for local errands by removing the "crutch" they have in easily finding parking. Creates more space for climate-positive environments swapping pavement for green spaces. Aging infrastructure - removes the need for the city to keep expanding roads to sustain the car use encouraged by ample parking availability. See CAR proposal that was submitted.</p>
11/27/2022	Parking Standards	<p>Summarized: "K2044 Planning - 5 Changes for a Better City". Parking Reforms for a Better City:</p> <p>The current strategy for parking falls short, and works against the key themes for the plan. Parking reforms are the lowest hanging fruit to progress. Kirkland risks reinforcing and reproducing the worst aspects of our car culture. Our current parking policy will have long lasting negative effects on our community. Here is a list of the changes Kirkland should pursue to lead the region when it comes to parking (in order of importance):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Eliminate parking minimums city wide - A growing number of people want to live car-free and options are limited due to our parking policies. We can reduce our emissions, reduce our traffic, and create more affordable housing if we change our relationship with parking. Let the market, developers, and homeowners decide what is right when it comes to parking. Don't force people to pay more for housing with a parking space if they don't need one.</li> <li>2. ALTERNATIVE 1A: If not eliminating parking minimums city wide, eliminate parking minimums within a 1/2 mile of frequent transit - this should be incorporated in the K2044 Plan at the bare minimum.</li> <li>3. ALTERNATIVE 1B: Eliminate parking minimums within 1/2 mile of the Cross Kirkland Corridor (in addition to Alt 1A) - This is our active transportation highway and a beloved feature of our city. People should have the option to live car free near this sustainable transportation corridor.</li> <li>4. Parking maximums should be enacted - convert the current parking minimums to parking maximums to prevent the problem of overbuilding parking.</li> <li>5. Add Minimum bike parking requirements at most non-residential developments. Add secure, weatherproof bike parking requirements at locations that are likely to be a riders' last stop of the day.</li> <li>6. Provide car-share options for people in our urban centers. Providing people more flexible options for living and mobility supports vibrant communities and sustainable communities.</li> </ol> <p>An extremely important final note is that eliminating parking minimums is NOT the same as banning parking. Many people enjoy their car and seek housing that includes parking and frequent businesses that provide parking. The good news is that the vast majority of existing housing and businesses already include parking and developers may still include parking under these reforms if they so desire. (Of course, accessible parking spaces should still be mandated wherever necessary.) Ultimately, parking reforms can provide cheaper housing and help Kirkland support a more diverse and inclusive community.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
4/11/2023	2035 Growth Targets	How are we doing meeting our housing and job targets for the year 2035?
5/23/2024	Design Review	I have learned that design review processes by neighbors add little if any value, though, according to a local architecture firm who presented at a recent Livable Kirkland meetup, preparing and managing these design review processes account for about 1/3 of their project budgets. I suggest that design reviews be dropped, significantly scaled back, or dramatically reimagined to provide more relevant input. Kirkland's design review board tends to be made up of folks who are neighbors rather than intended residents. Neighbors who pass by the outside of a building don't have insight into or interest in making the lives of future residents meaningfully better while taking into consideration trade-offs due to budget. Our current design review process tends to demand costly features such as modulation and upper story setbacks - features that detract from the usefulness of the living space.
5/23/2024	General	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife submitted a comment letter that included a table with several specific comments and recommendations about the Land Use Element.
4/11/2023	GMA requirements	What are the goals of the Washington State Growth Management Act (GMA)
4/11/2023	Home occupations	Encourage more home- based businesses-
2/25/2024	Housing Intensity	In favor for high-intensity housing near transit
6/11/2024	Inclusive Design	Advocating for Kirkland to be a Feminist City; several examples and links included in comment.
4/11/2023	Industrial uses	Retain industrial areas for small industrial or manufacturing businesses; not housing
5/23/2024	Jobs-Housing Balance-Simplify zoning	Build more housing; encourage a one to one jobs to housing balance; simplify zoning districts
5/21/2024	Land Use	<p>I believe every community needs to decide if it's going to be a suburb, with almost exclusively single family houses, car dependent neighborhoods and a lack of public spaces, or it would rather be a town, with public transportation, shops in walking distance and an abundance of public spaces. I feel like Kirkland made this decision years ago, now it's time to adapt the rules and regulations of the city accordingly.</p> <p>The price of housing in Kirkland is at a level where most people teaching here, or working at the grocery stores and restaurants cannot afford to live here. Not only is this unfair, but it's also bad for people who already live here, because commuters increase the amount of traffic for everyone and make things even more expensive than they already are. Changing zoning to allow for more density will create more housing and hopefully stabilize real estate prices and allow for adding more public transportation for the city. Easing up on parking mandates is another key ingredient for making housing affordable and at the same time limiting the impact of the growing urban density on traffic.</p> <p>Allowing mixed use zoning also reduces the number of car trips by bringing businesses closer to consumers and while I understand that there are concerns about the viability of shops and other businesses in residential areas, but I don't see any harm in allowing them. If they are not viable, they will close or not even open. The ones that are viable, will be a great asset to the community. Also, more density will help these businesses to thrive.</p>
5/20/2024	Land Use	<p>We would prefer more retail or commercial instead of residence unit. It will help the development of the area and attract young people like us.</p> <p>Currently many young people are heading to totem lake village and dt Kirkland for shopping which is another reason why the traffic is bad.</p>
12/11/2023	Land Use	<p>Before the City moves forward with a project, please identify and quantify the desired outcome. For example, # of users, etc....</p> <p>Then go back and see if the decision or project is performing. If the project is not performing, then remove it rather than continue to spend money on it if it's not performing. Also, the city is way behind in maintenance. Focus on maintaining what you have.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use	<p>To reduce the public's uncertainty surrounding the draft comp plan, including the K-line Metro route, I suggest:</p> <p>The PC include in the draft language direction to CC to guide staff to increase the collaboration with Metro regarding the K-line. After which, the city and Metro would sign a joint Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) of the plan. Over the years, as city and Metro officials move on, we will have a document in the file regarding this important topic. I am hearing great concern that the city will upzone and the K-line will not happen. Leaving the city with the worst-case scenario, more density, and more traffic with no new bus lines.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Change Request	Request change to proposed Land Use Map designation for two properties located at 9205 NE 120th ST and 11933 93rd Ave NE from proposed residential mixed use (currently zoned RM 3.6(2) to community mixed use. A third adjacent owned vacant property is shown as community mixed use.
9/28/2024	Land Use Changes	I've seen that there's a loud group of people that are opposed to rezoning parts of Kirkland for higher density. I just wanted to make sure you hear from the other side- I love the idea and densifying Kirkland especially in the areas laid out is a great idea and suits where I want Kirkland to go in the future. Please proceed!
9/26/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We wish to record that we are opposed to the 4-6 story buildings being proposed along the Market St. corridor in the next 20 years. Why can't we continue to keep Kirkland to be the desirable community like it currently is?</p> <p>We don't believe that Kirkland needs to accommodate a greatly expanded population growth nor is there an actual demand for such a growth. Our home is near Market St. and that street has evening gridlock already. How could it handle any more traffic demand?</p> <p>Please carefully consider our views.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/26/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a voting resident of Kirkland. I do not want increased housing density "near transit" outside of an urban or commercial center. The term "near transit" is too vague and could mean any bus route. I do not want increased housing choices in residential areas through promoting the redevelopment of public lands, such as public parks, schools, churches and green spaces. Other cities like Bellevue and Redmond, do not heavily target residential neighborhoods for this kind of development. Why is Kirkland not following their lead?
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud resident of Houghton for 48 years I was very disappointed and dismayed to learn just recently that the city I always trusted wanted to rezone our beautiful single family Houghton neighborhood into one which would allow 4-6 story buildings, which to the best of my knowledge currently only exist in downtown Kirkland.</p> <p>After thinking about it, I would suggest a compromise for the Planning Commissions consideration. If they are forced to do this then it would much more palatable and would have far less impact on the Houghton residential neighborhood to reduce the 1/2 mile setback for the rezone area on the west side of 108th Ave NE that is to be approved for 4-6 story buildings to instead be limited to the area between 106th Ave NE and 108th Ave NE (between 53rd street and 68th street ). A similar setback distance would also be better on the East side of 108th Ave NE.</p> <p>This would put the unsightly and undesirable tall buildings that no one wants to be next to mostly on 108th Ave NE with some on 106th Ave NE where they are much better suited and would greatly reduce the impact on the single family homes with views that could and would otherwise be blocked by implementing the larger 1/2 mile rezone criteria.</p> <p>I think this would provide more than enough area for high density buildings for many years to come and would be even more accessible to the bus transit corridor. I would be interested in your response to this proposal</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	We are writing to tell you that we are strongly opposed to the Transit Corridor proposal that you are considering. As 26 year residents of the Norkirk neighborhood we are very concerned that our quiet residential area of single family homes will be irreparably changed by this proposal. If this happens, we will leave Kirkland because it is the sense of neighborhood and community that drew us here and will be lost with this development proposal. If you approve this measure, we will devote every resource to ensure that the approving council members are not reelected
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have known you for a number of years and am very aware of your bias on housing. I am also aware that if the corridor plan goes thru and years later it is decided that more density and height can be expanded on the 85th street station plan you would benefit economically by such a decision. Therefore with your bias and possible outcomes I want it to be clear that you do not represent the position of the residents in SRHBT neighborhood. That position has been stated in writing from the board of directors with a 90% vote on the position by the entire board. Let me be clear that the big concern I hear throughout our neighborhood is that the plan would make over 60% of the current housing area into possible urban density swaths via the NE 70th and NE 85th corridors. It would essentially wipe out our neighborhood as we now know it to be. People here understand the need for growth but not more than what is required and we already have two major areas planned for such growth in the NE 85th street plan and the Bridle Trails Shopping center current and future development. By the way those two areas had extensive local input and you were a big part of that effort.</p> <p>I also hear that people want smart and controlled growth but still maintain our neighborhood to not be a major dense urban swath. At our Tuesday neighborhood general meeting one new resident said it very clearly, if I wanted to be in a dense urban environment I would have located in downtown Kirkland, but I did not want that so that is why I chose this neighborhood".</p> <p>Since I have been a long term resident of this neighborhood and walk it every day and talk with the locals I feel a connection to their wants and fears. Smart controlled and already located growth is in order and I urge you to not recommend the Corridor plan as a part of the city's 2044 growth plan.</p> <p>I will close with a metaphor I have used to give one an image of what my friends and neighbors are feeling.</p> <p>The city ready has the means to study and look at what might be for the future so it is not necessary to add LY 2.4</p> <p>Now the metaphor: if you have your home and you want it safe you probably have a lock on the front door and maybe an additional chain lock. So when you hear a knock you can choose to answer and open the door partially and see who is there then it is your choice to unlock the chain, but from that point on the person can enter and maybe do what ever. For the growth plan the door is open with already existing options and from what I hear the citizens do not want to unlock the chain.</p> <p>SRHBT Neighborhood Board VP</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	We are in strong opposition to this plan!

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First, let me express my gratitude and appreciation for your service. What you've taken on for our beloved city is an important function to organized government. It's also important to keep at the forefront to maintain representation of those you represent. As a voting King County and Kirkland citizen, I'd like to express my concerns about the currently laid 2044 Plan. I am certain you've heard from many. From both sides. Likely many more from the supporting side, and likely many of whom do not reside, nor work in Kirkland. As a property owner, a business owner and a life long resident of King County, I'm disheartened on the current direction of our beloved city. Not that this is of consequence, but my great grandparents are buried in the Kirkland cemetery. They were some of the first to reside in Kirkland. I didn't know much about this until my husband and I purchased our property in February 2006. We purchased a home built by Peter Kirk and Co in 1889. Our home is one block from Market Street and one block from Heritage Park. In our opinion, it's a tiny gem of our city. It holds so much of our history and the story of Kirkland.</p> <p>Our property is just over 5,000 square feet. We're on the corner. We have been told we are the foothold to many around the area, as we hold little, mini musical performances on our covered porch (began during Covid). We invite the neighbors over often. We have held neighborhood parties, all Kirkland parties, and all the rest. We are connectors, or so we've been told. I'm telling you this bit about us so you better understand our tiny, itty bitty footprint. All 5,000 +sq ft of land. We are part of what makes neighbors know each other. We are part of bringing together generations. We are part of bringing folks together that are of different color, different backgrounds, different religions. My husband is a twice over refuge, once from Egypt, once from Lebanon (to the US in 1967) and became a US citizen soon after. I was fortunate enough to be born in Seattle to first generation Washingtonians. My heart is in this land. Our hearts our on 5th Ave West. Kirkland. Our heart is Kirkland. The proposed Transit Corridor needs more work! The irony of calling the plan Transit Corridor is humorous. There's not a transit system in place to accommodate the CURRENT environment. We wonder how a proposal to bring a massive influx of folks into the TC without an actual transportation system would work. In fact, it won't. I could bring up the many concerns, likely addressed by others before me, so I won't. I would like to bring up something that came to me a few days ago. The what ifs. What ifs are exactly that and I get it. But what ifs have recently happened, and I don't think many are thinking about the "What Ifs". So here goes. What if we have a natural disaster. Scarily, we're overdue for one. One what? A big one. A big earthquake. What would that look like, no one really knows, but what we do know is that a BIG ONE is due. Take a big earthquake in our region and apply it to Kirkland. Deviation. Loss of homes, business and sadly lives. Why is this important? The Transit Corridor is approximately 6,000 acres. What happens if some of that 6,000 acres is devastated by a natural disaster? Insurance. Rebuild. Simple, right? Not so much. Look at Jasper, WY, look at Lahaina, HI. Those two towns were lost in mere hours. Rebuild, right? Nope! Land grabs. All sorts of chaos. Liken that to a massive disaster in our area. 6,000 acres have become "available" to rezoning. Upzoning in upwards of 6 stories (and more, on record verbally). Do we want to open that door? I'll tell you, my husband and I DO NOT want this to be an opportunity. We want to bring more housing options into Kirkland. We want our employees to live within a reasonable area to get to work. We want all to be housed. We want a community that supports each other. We want and can have a city that embraces these things in the right way! The Transit Corridor is NOT the right way to make this happen. Please have the city staff work WITH the citizens of Kirkland to find an option that makes sense for all of Kirkland. The time is now for you to take appropriate action. We appreciate being heard.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a long term resident of Kirkland, West of Market, for over 30 years, I am completely agast at this proposal to put apartment/condominium/mid-rise structures in this peninsula of a neighborhood... Having paid property taxes that have increased from \$2,400/yr to \$24,000/yr is horrific for anyone (except the very rich that are displacing people like us), but to add insult to injury, now you want to build (to put money in your pockets), which will impact us (taking views, etc.) as it will reduce the value of our home.</p> <p>It really seems that this 'transit corridor', which is one bus, usually completely empty, is not truly in need of more density.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed land use plan as a concerned Kirkland resident. I have lived in Washington State all my life and specifically in Kirkland at the Brezza Condos since Feb 1997. I have seen many changes in Kirkland and witnessed the City Council struggle to find it's way with what our community stands for considers the voices of the residents. While I fully support the need for thoughtful development, the current proposal far exceeds what is necessary or sustainable for our community. Kirkland's success has naturally led to increased demand for housing, but we must address this demand without sacrificing the qualities that make Kirkland such an attractive and livable city.</p> <p>Guiding Responsible Growth: Kirkland's housing affordability issue is a consequence of its success. The city's proximity to major job centers, combined with its excellent schools, parks, and diverse neighborhoods, naturally makes it a desirable place for high-income workers. However, the proposed plan's sweeping upzoning, allowing for 4-6 story buildings across nearly 9 square miles, threatens to drastically and unnecessarily reshape our community, potentially leading to a decline in livability. There is already enough rezoning in place to meet the state's housing goals. Adding an additional 100,000 potential units, which would triple Kirkland's population, far exceeds the city's needs. This massive scale is unprecedented and unnecessary.</p> <p>Ensuring Adequate Infrastructure: Transportation is the ultimate limiting factor for any new housing development. Kirkland's current infrastructure is already struggling, with gridlock occurring regularly. Adding 30,000 more cars from already approved zoning changes will only worsen this. The proposed land use plan will push Kirkland's transportation and school systems to a breaking point, with no clear solutions. We cannot responsibly increase density without ensuring our roads, transit, and schools are adequately prepared for such growth. The commute time from just getting from downtown to the I-405 has increased significantly let alone the I-405 constraints we already experience.</p> <p>Promoting an Open and Transparent Process: While city staff may claim that the proposed land use plan merely "allows" rezoning, it's clear that once this plan is approved, developers will quickly file rezoning requests that the city will struggle to deny. This sets a dangerous precedent, giving developers the legal upper hand and leaving residents with limited recourse. Transparency and citizen engagement must be prioritized in these decisions. Kirkland residents should not live in fear that their neighborhoods will be drastically altered by developments that do not align with the city's vision or its current infrastructure capabilities.</p> <p>In summary, I urge you to reconsider the scale of this proposed plan and to prioritize responsible growth. We all want to address housing affordability and ensure Kirkland's future remains bright, but this plan risks doing more harm than good. Let's focus on responsible growth, build on the existing zoning, and ensure that our infrastructure can support any new development without overwhelming our community. I appreciate your consideration of these concerns.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a longtime Houghton resident for twelve (12) years, I urge you to vote to reject the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 and remove it from the Comprehensive Plan consistent with the Houghton Neighborhood Association (HNA) letter dated August 22 as copied by reference below and based on the factors noted therein which we fully endorse and support</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We are a 40+ year residence of Kirkland and our business is also located in Kirkland for the same amount of time of time.</p> <p>We are strongly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan!</p> <p>We do ask that all of Policy LU-2.4 and any/all associated items be removed!</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The draft 2044 Comprehensive Plan must be scaled back and simplified by removing all mention of "Transit Corridors" and restoring the all "Residential" areas to the "Land Use" section. Growth and density increases are to be focused on the three existing urban areas: downtown, the Station Area, and the Totem Lake business district.</p> <p>The Comprehensive Plan needs to set a framework and outer limit on growth that strictly meets legal and legitimate obligations and growth targets. The draft plan proposes that Kirkland provide far more growth than is required. Excessive growth must be removed from the plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have lived in Kirkland for 25 years and I am very concerned by the actions that the planning board have taken thus far. I am writing to voice my opinion to the current planning committee's stand on the transit corridors especially the establishment of the K-line on 108th. I am at a loss for words that would effectively describe how concerned I am with the irresponsible planning that is taking place. Creating these transit corridors would absolutely ruin this city and there is no need to do this to meet our cities needs for growth. It is clear that outside interests are having more of a say than our own planning commission and council members. The plan that metro has for the K-line does not sit well considering it is in the middle of a quiet residential neighborhood and those who live in the surrounding area's would like to keep it that way. We have main routes such as 405 and 85th that are more commercially focused that should support the need. Additionally it has been shown that there is not a need for that mass transit line on 108th. It was said that those who live off of 108th were sent notice of the K-line plan, we did not receive any such notice as well as several of our neighbors. It seems to me that the higher powers would like to avoid public opinion. I would hope that you would support your voters and taxpayers in Kirkland and keep the outside interest out of Kirkland, it will only serve them and not the hard working Kirkland residence. Listen to the out cry of your residence and do the right thing. Below i have copied the thoughts our the Houghton community group and I am in agreement with all of the points that have been made below as well. As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</li> <li>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</li> <li>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to</li> </ol>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a longtime Kirkland resident, taxpayer and voter who is excited about the future of Kirkland I am writing to share my opposition to and full rejection of the transportation corridor and land use proposal LU2.4. These perspectives are largely shared by:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Many other residents, taxpayers and voters across Kirkland (as evidenced by many I have spoken with and documented in an online petition that has received over 3,000 signatures)</li> <li>• Multiple Neighborhood Associations from across Kirkland</li> </ul> <p>I am strongly asking for LU2.4 to be rejected for many reasons including those noted below. These reasons - and many others - have been highlighted by multiple other individuals, Neighborhood Associations and groups who have shared feedback in person, in writing and other means.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The direct benefits of LU2.4 to the existing residents, taxpayers and voters of Kirkland are unclear. Especially with the public funding and logistical disruptions this would inevitably impose, direct benefits should be clear if an investment of this size is to be even materially discussed, let alone committed to.</li> <li>2) These proposed changes are excessive and unnecessary. Kirkland has already established goals and made commitments to deliver them. The Station Area on 85th was planned for multiple years and delivers what is right and required for Kirkland at this time. The right time to evaluate future additional material evolutions is when the impact of massive investments such as the 85th Station Area have been lived and realized. This will give relevant data to make additional plans on. Massive transportation investments should be secured with proven adoption rates before taking on additional growth centers.</li> <li>3) The transit corridors called for in LU2.4 are unnecessary for Kirkland to meet its mandated growth targets.</li> <li>4) Commercial centers and middle housing are more reasonable places to explore much of what LU2.4 pushes for, and these options should be further discussed and planned prior to the large overreaches of LU2.4.</li> <li>5) These plans seem to be most strongly advocated for by those who have: a) conflicted personal incentives/outside interests, b) are not Kirkland residents/taxpayers/voters, or c) both a &amp; b</li> <li>6) A stated and implied goal of all of this is it will reduce the cost of housing in specific neighborhoods - but there has been no conclusive data presented that LU2.4 will in fact reduce the cost of housing in specific neighborhoods</li> <li>7) Much of what LU2.4 plans to do runs counter to what many current Kirkland residents, taxpayers and voters want from their City and why they chose to move here. This includes previous agreements such as the Houghton Everest Neighborhood (HENC) comprehensive plan from 2016.</li> </ol> <p>If you insist upon wanting to continue with LU2.4 I ask you to simply make it a public vote and let the residents and taxpayers make the decision</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We do not support the intense densification of Kirkland's residential neighborhoods. The changes to the Comprehensive Plan that will permit 4-6 story buildings ¼ mile deep into our neighborhoods need the infrastructure to support it.</p> <p>Developers will haphazardly fill these neighborhoods with four to six-story apartment buildings with minimal setbacks and significantly reduced parking requirements. The residents of these 4-6 story buildings will have cars, even though the plan assumes they will not need one. This has not worked in Seattle and other areas of increased density. The current high volume traffic will not allow for the this growth. The traffic along Market Street alone is always backed up from 85th to Fire Station 21 during rush hour. If the case of a fire, it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to get through. Residential neighborhoods will have higher cut-through traffic as people try to avoid clogged arteries. Nothing in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan addresses these concerns or improves any of Kirkland's existing infrastructure to handle these issues.</p> <p>This is putting the cart way before the horse. We would appreciate a longer study as to the ramifications of this plan on the infrastructure</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to voice my disapproval of the proposed language designating specific transit corridors for increased density in the land use portions of the 2044 comprehensive plan. Current zoning for the 85th St. Station area and other areas will provide more than enough housing units for growth forecast in our city and the current proposals do nothing to address the need for workforce and low-income housing. Meeting those needs is a complex issue and the city's resources would be better utilized exploring a range of options including developing social housing and the use of housing subsidies for public employees and those who work in sectors that support critical social infrastructure in our community such as teachers and health care workers. I am also concerned that the proposed language does not fully take into account the precariousness of public transit service, especially along the NE 70th St. Corridor. Service along that corridor has degraded markedly since 2013 with the cancellation of the 238 route and the subsequent closure of the Houghton Park and Ride. Given the significant changes in density already occurring in former single family neighborhoods due to the rapid increase of ADU/DADU construction, I want to see the city pause on planning to overlay yet another layer of density throughout large areas of the city.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As you prepare for tonight's meeting, as a long-time resident of Kirkland, I would like to let you know my thoughts. I have always voted, and will give myself a B- for the level of research and fact finding I do on issues before I (and our family of 4 voting residents) cast my vote. There has been much discussion, particularly in the last few months about the direction Kirkland is headed with assorted land use plans. This discord has compelled me to up my game in the research department and get answers for myself.</p> <p>I should have paid more attention earlier, but here we are now and I have done the research. While I fully understand that with the growth to the greater Seattle area, each area needs to address acceptable growth options for their cities. I am not opposed to growth, absolutely understand the needs for housing, but feel the plans for housing surrounding the transit corridors is not the right move for our city. The pre existing re-zoning plans are sufficient, and with the zoning proposed, and the potential number of housing units will make this city unlivable, especially with unsupported infrastructure needs, it is not necessary and not what your constituents want. Traffic already is horrible and I don't think King County transit has any plans to support that growth. Bus service is continually declining with less routes and the bus system here stinks. I could go deep into the particulars and cite very specific parts of the plan I am against, but my guess is you already know. This is a very slippery slope for our city, and I truly fear that this unprecedented plan that IS NOT wanted by current voting residents will ruin this city. I am committed to actively campaigning for and against each council member up for election in December 2025 and every election thereafter based on their stance on this issue. Please listen to the residents of this city, take your time, re think these actions, build on the other pre existing growth plans that make sense, take the new zoning changes off the table and listen to your constituents who actually live her and vote, not outside agencies with ulterior motives. We live here and want the best for this community. Responsible, reasonable, transparent efforts to continue to improve our city. Thank you very much, tonight will be a very interesting meeting, please do the right thig for you residents who live here and have been paying taxes.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to formally raise my concerns about the premature closure of the public hearing period for the Kirkland 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I have recently learned that the public hearing and written testimony process is scheduled to end on September 12, 2024. This deadline is concerning given that critical studies—specifically those related to environmental impact, infrastructure, and economic effects—are still outstanding. The available information does not meet the necessary standards for public hearing of a proposal of this magnitude.</p> <p>These comprehensive analyses are vital for ensuring informed public input and effective decision-making. The lack of these essential studies compromises the integrity of the public hearing process and limits stakeholders' ability to fully understand the potential impacts of the proposed plan.</p> <p>In light of these issues, I respectfully request that the City of Kirkland extend the public hearing period until all necessary studies are completed and made accessible to the public. This extension is crucial for a fair and transparent process, allowing for meaningful public engagement and thorough review of all relevant information. Furthermore, I urge that no decisions be made regarding the comprehensive plan until a full set of studies is completed and public feedback is adequately considered.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to this important matter. I look forward to your prompt response and the necessary steps to address these concerns</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>While i am cutting and pasting the letter suggested by the people that truly care about the city of Kirkland, i am horrified by the people on this council that support destroying the city that i have called home for 25 years. From the lack of transparency to ignoring the will of the Kirkland residence, this council continues with their plan to ruin Kirkland's attractiveness.</p> <p>We are a large town with a small town feel, and i should hope it continues this way. Vote for Kirkland, not for the outside interests that will benefit.</p> <p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents.</p> <p><u>We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology.</u></p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my husband and daughter, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I haven't written yet on this, and I'm writing because I haven't heard anyone represent our neighborhood in the recent Council and Planning meetings I've attended. I'm representing my Bridle Trails/South Rose Hill neighborhood along NE 70th St, which is single-family residences on both sides of NE 70th St from I405 east to past 132nd Ave NE and from NE 60th St north to NE 85th St. Our neighborhood is showing up largely within the Transit Corridors area that is proposed for consideration of multi-family with commercial and for increased density per lot.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• The Transit Corridors plan depicts bifurcating and destroying the entire center of our neighborhood by eliminating at least 50% of our neighborhoods and replacing them with multifamily and commercial uses! Even if the area of increased density is smaller, it would still bifurcate our neighborhood and forever change its character and the benefits that it contributes to making Kirkland such a great place.</li> <li>• There is mention of consideration of increased density on individual lots.</li> <li>• These are our neighborhoods and our homes – this affects real residents of the City - a great percentage of the residents. Our voices are being stifled.</li> </ul> <p>I've heard more information and more often from the City about subjects such as the proposed pool and bacteria in the lake than I've heard about such tremendous changes and extraordinary destruction of our neighborhoods and the environment, far beyond any state mandates, that are being proposed that affect us and our livelihoods.</p> <p>I beg you to please find the solutions that don't destroy our single-family neighborhoods and the environment. Solutions are out there and Transit Corridors and increased density on individual lots aren't the answer. Remove Transit Corridors and Increased Density per Lot from Comp Plan</p> <p>Please remove the Transit Corridors and any reference to increased density (like 4-6 units per lot) out of the Comp Plan and replace it (if not already covered in existing plans) with focused attention in the already designated urban centers. That's what urban centers are for. Please consider how 7 people on a Council or a Commission can be making such extraordinarily permanent and destructive decisions like this? How can Council be proposing more than the state mandated growth, and proposing outside of our already designated urban centers of Totem Lake and Downtown/85th which had public process and years of public input? As stated by others, • We're not against the growth that the state mandates. • We're not against putting that growth in the urban centers that are on the major arterials (85th and Totem Lake) adjacent to the large transportation hubs planned for and being built, where utilities and facilities can be upgraded more easily and less costly, where green spaces and yards aren't being destroyed. • We're not against partnerships that could build affordable housing to help our small business owners and long-time workers, if the dense housing is placed in existing urban centers near transportation that's being built. Toll on your Neighbors</p> <p>There is a very real toll to what you're doing. I haven't written before because me and my neighbors are still processing the shock of finding out (from other neighbors, not from the City) about these recently proposed Transit Corridors and increased density per lot. The proposed bifurcation and destruction of our single-family neighborhoods from these proposed Transit Corridors is taking physical, mental and emotional tolls on me and my neighbors. These have very real effects on each of us as individuals. My neighbors are too busy raising their children and working to be able to write to you themselves. Your dismissiveness of our concerns and views and the distress you're causing with these proposals are having very real consequences on us, your residents that you've been elected to consider and represent. • There are solutions that don't require this kind of destruction of what makes</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my parents, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concern with the proposed Land Use Amendment to the 2044 Comprehensive plan. I ask that you remove section LU 2.4 on transit corridors and take Option B1 – Consider a version of Policy LU-2.4 at a future date, and add a discrete task to a future Planning Work Program to study a policy directing exploration of appropriate place for density near transit. I am pro-growth, but also pro-infrastructure, transparency and responsibility for how this growth is achieved in our city. The current Land Use proposal does not achieve any of those. Our city has a viable plan for growth within urban centers which should be the focus of the 2044 plan. The transit corridor amendment is unnecessary and lacks sufficient data to prove it would lead to affordable housing in Kirkland.</p> <p>We need a plan that shows:</p> <p>Additional density will equate to affordable housing.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Neighboring cities which invested in high density housing have not seen affordable results (Remond, Seattle).</li> <li>b. No information has been provided by the city to justify that development in these areas will lead to affordable housing.</li> <li>c. Conduct studies and provide data that proves additional housing will be affordable in the areas proposed before locking in that these specific corridors are the right answer for our future.</li> </ol> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Appropriate infrastructure along transit corridors to accommodate new density.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Metro bus service is unreliable on many of these corridors. Schools are already overcrowded. Traffic is at a standstill already in many of these areas.</li> <li>b. Appropriate analysis and plans are required before locking into develop areas without appropriate infrastructure.                 <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Specific corridors that would be most viable.                     <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Not all the corridors in the map are equally viable. There are environmental concerns, parking constraints, and narrow roads in some of these areas that cannot handle additional traffic or ensure availability of emergency services.</li> <li>b. Complete the viability analysis of which corridors should be included BEFORE adopting this into the comprehensive plan.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> </li> <li>4. Why we need more density than already planned for within the urban centers.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. Our current plans very recently enacted for the 85th street &amp; Totem lake urban centers meet the needs for additional density in our city.</li> <li>b. Provide a full analysis of why these corridors are required for future growth.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Kirkland cannot afford to move forward with the transit corridor plan without adequate plans to ensure infrastructure and services are in place to support such growth. It is a responsibility to ensure that the needs of current and new residents will be supported by this plan and so far, there is not enough evidence to prove that. I support responsible and data-driven growth which this Planning Commission needs to work more diligently on before adopting the Land Use measures.</p> <p>Please vote tonight to take Option B1 and remove transit corridors into the Comprehensive plan</p> </li></ol>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have been a homeowner and voting resident of Kirkland for 32 years. As I have become aware of your plans for my neighborhood and a vast number of neighborhoods in Kirkland, I see a future of living in terror when neighbors sell their homes. There is no single family resident who has invested in Kirkland that wants a 4 - 6 story building in front of, beside or behind their home. Mixing 4 - 6 story buildings among single family homes destroys the quality of life that prompted residents to buy homes in Kirkland.</p> <p>As I understand it, Kirkland currently meets required state density requirements and is also not expected to be at risk of failing the requirements in the future. Additionally, the Kirkland plans would grossly exceed the state density requirements. The only winners I see from these proposed changes are the City of Kirkland, who benefits from increased tax revenues from multi-family dwellings on current single family real estate and the developers who will make millions from our properties. This is further evidenced by the City of Kirkland selecting some of the most expensive real estate within the City for this proposal. To the current residents of these areas, this is a land grab by the City of Kirkland and developers.</p> <p>We have elected you to manage the City according to what those who elected you want for their community, neighborhoods and city. Not to manage to your personal desires. The City of Kirkland is not a business to be run to increase tax revenues and help developers. A good indication of this is the City purchasing the old PCC land and getting into the development business itself. Using tax dollars to put in a development not desired by the neighborhood, with the City benefiting financially from its own zoning decisions.</p> <p>This proposal represents an egregious disregard for your existing constituents. As I understand it, there is one, maybe two council members who advocate listening to and representing the residents of the affected neighborhoods. These issues are so significant and have such an adverse impact on our neighborhoods that I will certainly support recall elections if it comes to that. Additionally, while it's difficult to achieve, it will be worth the effort to work towards de-annexation of the impacted areas from the City of Kirkland. De-annexation may be doable given the number of current Kirkland residents impacted by your proposal. To be clear, I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am 100% against the current Transit Corridor plan in its current iteration.</p> <p>I have been an on and off Kirkland resident since 1965. I have watched this lovely little town grow up to be a good-sized city. I love this city. I have around 1500 community volunteer hours (give or take) almost all of them digging up blackberries and canary grass and planting native plants and trees. If you walk out on the western most boardwalk of Juanita Bay Park on the left — what used to be just canary grass and blackberries is now an oasis for birds, bobcat, otters, beaver, and other wildlife. I dug up every blackberry and planted every tree. The hard part was the canary grass. I have spent over 11 years turning that into a native oasis as a member of the Green Kirkland team. I love our parks! I don't think there is a single day that I am not in one of our parks. They are the crown jewel of Kirkland — along with our lake and views.</p> <p>But to my chagrin, in all the years I lived here, I have not participated much in the civic affairs of our city. I have watched and seen how our council has sanely and responsibly worked to grow our city in a manner that made sense. I have long praised our City Council for its excellent stewardship of our city. I voted for many of you. But I no longer have that trust that all can safely be left in your hands and I can continue to think you guys have our best interests in mind. This transit corridor proposal has awakened me. I no longer trust that you have the best interest of your constituents in mind. Respectfully, many of you appear to be agenda driven, more motivated by this high-density ideology than you are about what your constituents want. You absolutely appear to think you know better than we. We understand the need for more housing. It is the ill-conceived notion that it makes sense to paint the city with half-mile swaths of "transit corridors" with NO nuance that has awakened so many of us. We know we need density. But not high density everywhere. High density should be where there are grocery stores and transit. We understand that we need to add cottages and ADUs to help meet the need we have for more housing. Please understand that we do not believe that future zoning will protect us from 4 to 6 story buildings in the future. We know the power the developers have. We are not against the idea of transit corridors — or I am not — we are against the lack of nuance needed to the neighborhoods. It should not be a half mile swath allowed for upzoning. A quarter of a mile into the Market neighborhood is MOST of the neighborhood. I need to keep this short for both our sakes. Briefly,</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Much more community outreach must be done. Most of us — if not all — were blindsided by this proposal and what it will do to our neighborhoods. We do not believe that future zoning will mitigate the destruction to our neighborhoods that this plan allows for. We all know what the developers are capable of. The idea of transit corridors has merit. The broad swath of a ¼ of a mile on either side is a horrendous idea.</li> <li>•Focus the high density in areas where there can more easily be more transit. Where there are grocery stores that you can get to on foot. Families are not going to go to a supermarket to do a weekly shop without a car. It's not going to happen. Unless you plan on not having families live here and are building a city for people without families.</li> <li>•ADUs - Cottages. While we need them, so we don't complain about them. But a drive down 18th Street in the Market neighborhood with all those tiny houses going in with next to no parking will be problematic. All will have cars. The streets are already a challenge to drive through and will have to become one-way at some point.</li> <li>•Traffic on Market — horrendous already and a real danger to children as they cross to school and to the convenience store. Very difficult to get in and out on to Market St. It used to be that left hand turns out of WoM where difficult. Now a right-hand turn is difficult. I will sit there behind many cars waiting for them to try</li> </ul>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have been following the recent discussions about Transit Corridors with great interest. I would like to express my opposition to including these in the updated comprehensive plan. When the first Finn Hill Neighborhood plan was developed, I joined my neighbors and staff from the Kirkland planning department in the many workshops and visioning sessions held. We made the neighborhood plan "ours". The collaborative process with the planning department allowed us to have buy-in on the direction of our community, and the 10-minute neighborhoods. We felt we had a say and we learned from the City Planners. That visioning also spawned the Green Loop that has found success in securing funding for property acquisition as we look to build this for the next generation of residents. The current neighborhood plan was built BOTTOM UP. The transit corridors are being FORCED DOWN.</p> <p>Where were the meetings with the neighborhoods during the alternatives analysis phase? Where was our opportunity to learn about the issues and help mold the solution before they were suddenly in the final draft? Transit Corridors are not studied well enough. They don't meet the current needs of residents, let alone future residents of higher density developments. You heard from a developer of affordable housing indicating that they wouldn't choose to build in these corridors and suggested learning what they look for in a community. Even the King County Affordable Housing Committee indicated that the analysis was insufficient. SEPA was insufficient, outreach was insufficient.</p> <p>We seem to be the only City NOT pushing back against the County asking us to show massive increases in density. Why are we putting arbitrary lines on a map and designating them for growth potential without actually looking at where the growth is appropriate first? Let's not overcommit ourselves or doom existing residents to being blocked in their neighborhoods because the corridors are impassable with stopped traffic.</p> <p>I'd also like to know why the northern segment of 100th was added last minute . This segment does not have frequent bus service, is regularly backed up with commuter traffic, and is single family residential on both sides. It also belongs to the Finn Hill neighborhood, which was not invited into the discussions.</p> <p>And I have grave concerns that the Finn Hill Neighborhood plan has been "cleaned up" by standardizing language. Some of the edits are no brainers, but the others admittedly removed the flavor of the neighborhood's vision and its wishes. It took the clarifying nuance out of the language so it could be interpreted differently depending upon who was reading it. It's like photocopying a color document in black and white and then using the copy to decide which new color shade to add. You can't color match to black and white.</p> <p>I am not anti-development. I agree with the current Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan, the current comprehensive plan and the reasonable growth that they call for. I am happy to see the improvements to 100th Ave NE that we have needed sorely for many years. I enjoy seeing the neighborhood get refreshed by homes being redeveloped, and accepting of split lots and new reasonable additions to density, because they were and are in the plan for growth in our neighborhood. We're not going to build ourselves out of an affordability crisis. We need to proceed thoughtfully and intentionally and not throw darts at a map. Please LISTEN to the residents asking for the transit corridors to be removed from this update. And then come talk with us. Work with the neighborhoods to come up with a solution TOGETHER....</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We do not support the intense densification of Kirkland's residential neighborhoods. The changes to the Comprehensive Plan that will permit 4-6 story buildings ¼ mile deep into our neighborhoods need the infrastructure to support it.</p> <p>Developers will haphazardly fill these neighborhoods with four to six-story apartment buildings with minimal setbacks and significantly reduced parking requirements.</p> <p>The residents of these 4-6 story buildings will have cars, even though the plan assumes they will not need one. This has not worked in Seattle and other areas of increased density.</p> <p>The current high volume traffic will not allow for the this growth. The traffic along Market Street alone is always backed up from 85th to Fire Station 21 during rush hour. If the case of a fire, it would be difficult for emergency vehicles to get through.</p> <p>Residential neighborhoods will have higher cut-through traffic as people try to avoid clogged arteries. Nothing in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan addresses these concerns or improves any of Kirkland's existing infrastructure to handle these issues.</p> <p>This is putting the cart way before the horse.</p> <p>We would appreciate a longer study as to the ramifications of this plan on the infrastructure</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Thank you to the Commission and City Staff, who are working hard on this comprehensive plan. I appreciate your efforts.</p> <p>I, along with my wife and daughter, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a Kirkland resident who will be affected by your hasty action.</p> <p>It appears now that it has come down to a numbers game of how many emails you have "for" and "against" the planning commission proposal, versus a thoughtful and responsible review of the facts. It is clear that more housing does not equal affordable housing. You all know this to be true. To maintain otherwise is either folly or a smokescreen. Please convince us that your consideration will be smarter than pandering to 'equity' slogans.</p> <p>The broad strokes in this proposal evidence the lack of nuance in your plan and belies any consideration or understanding of the differences in each of the 'transit corridors' you have painted with the same broad brush.</p> <p>I join with the residents who reject the false narratives about "legalizing housing".</p> <p>I believe that as individuals you know objectively that this plan isn't well thought out and will not achieve the aims that you have espoused. I implore you to be brave, exercising true leadership and reconsider this proposal</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. Further, I believe that many well intentioned people who are in favor of this proposal are being exploited; urged to action by private investors who stand to make piles of money on land speculation and redevelopment. Affordable housing and transportation are not prime concerns for these investment groups. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing today to express my vehement opposition to the transportation corridors and upzoning plan for multiple neighborhoods in Kirkland. As a 21-year resident of Kirkland, I find it unconscionable that both the planning commission and it seems the majority of the council are trying to push through a plan without involving the citizens who live here. Have any of you actually gone into the neighborhoods that will be affected by this plan and talked face to face with residents? Have you really taken a hard look at the impacts or practicalities of what you are proposing on the lives of the citizens you represent? Not that I've seen.</p> <p>First off, Kirkland has already exceeded the density requirements of the growth management act. Why must we try to keep going? Must we destroy the special character of our charming city and its unique neighborhoods? To what end? To win an award at a conference for city planners?</p> <p>Secondly, I have yet to see or read an infrastructure plan to manage all this proposed increased density. Our streets are already struggling to handle traffic from increased density currently being constructed all throughout the city. Evergreen Hospital is over capacity nearly all the time, by its own metrics posted on its website. And your plan is to drastically increase density in formerly single-family neighborhoods which will decrease quality of life, all while enriching developers and lining city coffers? Doesn't seem like a great plan.</p> <p>Thirdly, the notion that this plan will create affordable housing is laughable. In no world is land that costs nearly \$3 million dollars going to produce an affordable housing unit. 1,300 square foot ADUs are currently selling well in excess of \$1 million in these neighborhoods. By any measure, that's not affordable housing. And yes, it's unfair that not everyone gets to live in a beautiful neighborhood in Kirkland. I'd like to live next to Bill Gates in Medina. But I can't. Unfortunately, that's the system in this country. And you can't densify your way out from under that system.</p> <p>Unfortunately, you have created a divisiveness that did not previously exist in our community. We elected and trusted you with our best interests. And that trust has been breached. It seems that what is happening here is that an ideology is being rammed down the throats of citizens without thought, dialogue or proper planning. We are being asked to bow down at the altar of your ideology without question, and that just smacks of all sorts of history best not discussed here. What you are proposing is bad public policy. It's bad politics. It's bad for our communities. Please, reject this proposal.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>You have herd from the various neighborhoods in Kirkland regarding the 2044 Plan. Now is the time to remove the eight transit corridors from consideration. These proposed corridors are too large and too soon. We ask for transportation to be secured with proven adoption rates before taking on additional growth centers. The transit corridors are unnecessary for Kirkland to meet its mandated growth targets.</p> <p>If we hold our current course, we are on schedule to have excess housing capacity. Leave our Neighborhoods as Neighborhoods where families can enjoy the space. Do not allow such density on the corridors and infringe into our neighborhoods.</p> <p>Listen to the people who live here, have invested in Kirkland and want to keep Kirkland something to be proud of. STOP such corridor density.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I write with additional comments on the current proposals for the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. While I appreciate staff's and various Commissioners' efforts to acknowledge and respond to the concerns being expressed by the community about both the process and the 2044 Comprehensive Plan itself, primarily the Land Use and Housing elements as well as certain aspects of the various neighborhood plans, I do not believe that you have yet addressed the real issues. Under the requirements of the GMA, Kirkland both promoted and accepted a 2044 growth target of 13,200 additional housing units, of which 7,500 are to be affordable for those who at &lt;30% AMI for the area. That &lt;30% AMI number is far greater proportionally for Kirkland's size and infrastructure capacity than Bellevue's, for instance. Setting that aside for the moment, while existing zoning easily accommodates more than 6,000 surplus units over the total 13,200 Kirkland has been allocated, the current 2044 Comprehensive Plan does not properly address how to achieve the 7,500 for &lt;30% AMI. Further, it is internally inconsistent.</p> <p>The current proposed Plan acknowledges that Kirkland was several years ahead of the state legislature in making zoning changes to allow and encourage building ADUs, DADUs, duplexes, triplexes, cottages, and other "middle" housing in all residential areas of the city. Kirkland has not had single family zoning for several years. The intent was specifically to increase density and provide more affordable options for those at middle income levels. As staff, Council, and Planning Commission have correctly stated, it takes time to see impacts from such zoning changes – development doesn't happen overnight. We are now actually seeing a lot of development of such middle housing across the city. Along Market Street alone, we have 30 new or in construction units on just six lots. The current proposed Plan with the "Transit Corridors" would lay the foundation for zoning changes that could allow for 4-6 (or even higher according to some Commissioners and Councilmembers) story mixed-use/residential buildings anywhere and possibly everywhere throughout those identified Transit Corridors. Such zoning changes, if implemented throughout the identified Transit Corridors would allow for 100,000 additional units without any provisions that any of them would actually qualify as affordable generally or specifically for those at &lt;30%AMI.</p> <p>Meanwhile, other parts of the Land Use element specify</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1)development of higher intensity residential uses, including "affordable" housing should be focused in areas that already have commercial services and quality transit service,</li> <li>2)development of housing, offices, community facilities, shops and services should be encouraged at or near park &amp; ride lots and other transit facilities,</li> <li>3)reduced minimum lot sizes should be applied throughout residential zones to support more opportunities for fee-simple ownership, the highest intensity residential areas should be located close to shops/services, employment centers, and transportation hubs,</li> <li>4)new residential growth to meet sustainability, DEIB, and required allowances for middle-housing types should be encouraged in lower-intensity neighborhoods,</li> <li>5)existing TOD and commercial mixed-use areas should be maintained and strengthened by focusing economic development and "affordable" housing within them, and</li> <li>6)new housing and jobs production should be intentionally focused in the Totem Lake and Greater Downtown Urban/Regional Growth Centers. NOTE: As proposed by staff, the Transit Corridor plan would actually substantially lessen the projected housing in the Totem Lake area while significantly increasing the</li> </ol>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>It took me a while to figure out what felt fundamentally wrong about the proposed Comprehensive Plan, and I'd like to share it going into tonight's meeting. It's that developers, realtors, activists, and a number of members of the Council and the Planning Commission appear to view Kirkland as if it were uninhabited, just raw material for their designs. Oh—there are some arterials here—let's let developers build huge apartments there! No one lives there who that would affect, right? Actually, it's even worse. The people who live there are viewed as an impediment, and are demonized, as in: Wealthy people want to keep everyone else from having affordable housing for their own selfish reasons. The fact that residents actually live here, pay taxes here, vote here, and are invested in the community they've helped build is considered to be irrelevant. Kirkland is clay to be molded, and the people who live here are nothing but an impediment. That sounds exaggerated, but it's not. ask yourself this: What aspect of the proposed land use benefits existing residents? None whatsoever. Now ask yourself what aspect harms existing residents? Several, in a big way, including loss of view, loss of home value, and worse traffic. And the changes are not being put to a vote. I think that all makes it pretty clear that in fact existing residents are being treated as a nuisance to be ignored or swatted aside. Please represent the people who actually live here, who pay for the City to operate with their taxes, who vote here, and who have made it the special community that it is.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I hope you will not approve the insane plan to rezone from Residential to 4-6 story buildings in Houghton. This make absolutely no sense. If this plan is approved I would hope the residents in this area would file a Class Action lawsuit to protect the live ability and value of their homes. Having our view blocked could reduce e the value of our home by \$500,000. I for one would certainly be in favor of a Class Action Lawsuit should this plan be approved.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The City of Kirkland has accomplished some very good things. There are many examples of encouraging inclusion and diversity in our community, the recent Hispanic Month proclamation was terrific. The Urban Centers are beautiful, and in ideal locations, close to the freeway to avoid further exasperating the horrific traffic in Kirkland.</p> <p>We can all agree, we need more housing and affordable housing. But the far majority of the people of Kirkland do NOT agree with your plan to push density out into the residential neighborhoods. There are outside organizations that are pushing for this, which is becoming widely known and completely inappropriate. Please consider modifying the plan to a reasonable amount of densification, that meets the identified targets and DOES NOT destroy the neighborhoods of Kirkland. The Regional Urban Centers were developed for this kind of densification. The City of Kirkland folks are slowly learning about "the Plan" to exceed the needed densification and will not tolerate pushing it into the residential neighborhoods. If you believe there is a minority that feels this way, you are sorely wrong.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Planning Commissioners-I strongly urge you to reconsider the removal of all Residential land use designations from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I support a diversity of housing in Kirkland. Changing the three current Residential land uses to a single Residential Mixed Use designation will reduce housing diversity. Other cities near Kirkland are retaining some Residential land uses and designating some other areas for Mixed Use. I urge Kirkland to do the same. Another consideration: changing all residential zoning to mixed use would make Kirkland's residential areas subject to a different set of state laws/rules because those areas are now considered as mixed use instead of residential. Removing all residential land use designations from Kirkland would have much more significant impacts than is implied by a seemingly simple word change.</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing in opposition to the proposal to expand land-use in existing single-family residential neighborhoods to allow multi-story apartment buildings within one-quarter of a mile of designated transit corridors, LU 2.4</p> <p>Allowing multi-story apartment buildings to be placed scatter-shot within existing single-family neighborhoods would likely create traffic, parking, and environmental degradation and tax the existing infrastructure. Tree canopy, including loss of heritage trees, would likely be sacrificed during aggregation of parcels to make a project pencil out.</p> <p>A recent op-ed in the Seattle Times by a property developer argued that requiring infrastructure improvements cost too much. They said that improving streets, sidewalks, drainage, etc. should not be required for new projects. It was their excuse for not building "affordable" housing. They want to maximize profits, while minimizing externalities by pushing off the costs to existing residents. The new residents get a free ride, while imposing degraded quality of life on neighbors.</p> <p>My understanding is that without this change, the City will meet or exceed its requirements for housing. Growth should occur as envisioned in the 85th Station Area Plan, Downtown, and Totem Lake, and as new neighborhood centers are created in Finn Hill and Kingsgate.</p> <p>I am not against growth, but this plan will only degrade the neighborhoods and is a feel-good solution looking for a problem.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Thank you for taking the time to hear my concerns regarding the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I am a resident of Kirkland.</p> <p>I have serious concerns with the proposed 2044 Comprehensive Plan, specifically the overall growth targets outlined in the plan and the inclusion of LU-2.4. The growth targets that have been proposed are extreme and unwarranted per Washington State requirements. Attempting to add over 70K additional housing units by 2044 is overkill. This would add an additional 200K or more residents over the next twenty years - a 2X increase over the existing population. Growth projections from the CBO project that population growth will only increase at a rate of six tenths of a percent per year over the next 30 years (342M to 382M from 2024 - 2054) across the United States. Our State's projections assume Washington will grow around 3X the national rate, so why does this plan assume growth rates greater than 4X our State projections? The City of Kirkland's own Biennial Community Survey highlights that growth, specifically overdevelopment and traffic, as the biggest areas of concern for residents and that they are not satisfied with the City's response. Given this, why is the City prioritizing radical growth based on the influence of outside organizations versus the feedback from residents of Kirkland? This policy puts the cart before the horse. Why is the city planning for such a radical increase in housing units without plans in place to address funding, infrastructure, transit, schools, public safety, and many other critical gaps? Many of these "transit corridors" are on very quiet residential streets that have children - increasing density and therefore traffic without proper precautions on these streets is reckless and dangerous. These streets are not currently set up for high-density traffic and will need significant safety precautions prior to increasing traffic. Proponents of the plan have stated that the plan merely gives the city the ability to study the options and impacts of mixed density and rezoning. For example, the Livable Kirkland Facebook group, which is organized by two sitting planning commission members, recently put out a Myths vs. Reality memo espousing as much. This is nonsense and easily verifiable in the plan, which clearly states:</p> <p>"The Plan sets the framework for the City's land-use pattern and what uses are allowed where. It also provides the policy basis for building height, landscaping, sign standards, protection of lakes, streams and wetlands, and other development regulations. It is the foundation for the City's zoning and other code regulations and the Zoning Map." This is much more than the "ability to study". You don't actually need the inclusion of LU-2.4 to study the impacts of increased density and mixed-use zoning. Furthermore, density does not equal affordability. There's nothing the city could have done to prevent housing prices from elevating to the level they are at. We live in one of the most economically advantaged locations in the country, with access to some of the best and highest paid labor markets. Nothing could have prevented buyers from bidding up the housing market. This city will never be truly affordable again - at least not in the way that the Planning Commission (PC) and City Council (CC) claim it will be based on their plan. Giving people hope that this plan will provide an abundant supply of low-cost housing is disingenuous. At best we can add enough rental units to stymie the sharp increases in rent costs.</p> <p>Land speculation will drive the price of land up, along with construction costs. The rezoning of single family homes will force residents to compete with multinational corporations when trying to buy a home. More concerning long-term, the cost of delivering housing, comprising the land, physical construction costs, and the profit required for taking on the risk, means that appropriate accommodation for low income earners is unable to be delivered by the market at any meaningful scale.</p> <p>The city has built and is in the process of building significant high-density housing in existing commercial centers. I believe this is the right place for these units and would like to see the city continue with the expansion of urban/commercial centers that are adjacent to major transportation hubs and services such as Totem</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I did attend the last few meetings but I did not want to speak because of the men that were sitting right behind the podium. They were making faces and commenting on the speakers. I found it to be very shameful and I am embarrassed for the city of Kirkland. This should be a forum where everyone can actually say how they feel and not be put in an uncomfortable situation. I also had a problem with the quantity of people that were recruited that were not residents of Kirkland. I always wanted to live on the lake but that was never a possibility. I believe you need to listen to actual residents. There will always be people want to live in Kirkland but we are the residents of Kirkland and this affects our homes, families, schools and streets. I have been a tax payer and voter for half a century.</p> <p>I got out of college in the late 1970s. I worked at Boeing as an engineer. My starting salary was under 15 thousand dollars a year. At that time most of the starting level houses were over a hundred thousand dollars a year. My first house cost \$149,000.00. Yes this was ten times my starting salary. Just like all the people that testified it was very difficult to get into that first house. My wife and I lived with my parents and worked two jobs and shared a old hand me down car. We put off having a family until we saved enough for a down payment on a house. It has always been difficult for young people starting out to buy a house. Our first interest rate was at almost 14 percent. We sacrificed to get into the property that same property we now own. We put off having children. We lived with relatives. We never bought a new car. Once we bought our house we just lived in it and put off remodeling until we saved enough to make our home better. It was shameful of all the people testifying that I was one of the "Wealthy few that could own a house" or as commissioner Jacobsen has said "the rich need to do their share also". Most Kirkland residents that have bought houses and have children are not rich. Most are getting by and living their lives. All of the people that testified that they are working in tech are making more money than I ever did in my career. Now as retired couple we are on a fixed income and I dread the over 20 thousand dollar a year tax bill that I get for living in that starter home that I bought almost 50 years ago. Your corridor plan will hugely increase this tax bill. Once my property is considered commercial for a multi family building every builder and developer will be bidding for the properties for sale. On my street there has not been a sale to a family for years. It has all been developers taking down the old houses and building giant houses. The average price of these houses have been 3 to 4 million. This has caused my tax bill to go from an original 1,200 dollars a year to over 20 thousand dollars a year. As commissioners you need to realize the consequences that you will be imposing on the existing residents. I am the missing middle income and you will be driving me out of my own home.</p> <p>I am not rich and have never been rich. I commuted every day to work at Boeing and yes it sometimes took an hour to get there and an hour to return. We heard people testify that people working in Kirkland can't live here. Most people in Kirkland have had to commute to work. Yes it is a luxury to live and work close by. I have never had that luxury. Similarly many that work in Kirkland have chosen to commute because they want a house instead of living in an apartment. Our lots in Kirkland will not increase with the corridor plan. They will diminish. Currently the state plan will allow for each lot in our cities and towns over 25,000 residents to be allowed 6 units. This will come into effect this next year. The city of Kirkland has not even seen the results of this huge allowance for building. The corridor plan is too rash at a time when the state rules are allowing building on every single lot in Kirkland. This is not fair to the residents.</p> <p>I also believe that the idea that more building will cause the affordability to drop. We have not ever seen this happen in Kirkland. The only time I ever saw prices drop was during the financial crisis in 2008. Even during that period Kirkland did not see a huge downturn. By 2010 our prices were again on the rise. To build</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Merely labeling something as a "Transit Corridor" does not transform it into a corridor for transit. The proposed land use changes to the 2044 Comprehensive Plan's presuppose the conversion of several Kirkland arterials into transit corridors, assuming a diversification in transportation modes and enhanced mass transit infrastructure.</p> <p>In principle, the adoption of more efficient mass transit options is favorable. Long-time Kirkland residents have experienced the deleterious impacts from the congestion of cross-city arterials during peak travel times. Regrettably, the "Transit Corridor" proposals are based on presumptions rather than concrete plans. Prior to the implementation of Policy LU-2 (in any amended version), the Planning Commission should present detailed, specific plans for each "Transit Corridor" and its necessary modifications. Kirkland differs from Redmond, Bellevue, Woodinville, and Seattle. Only a handful of Kirkland's arterials, such as 85th St NE/Central Way, 98th/100th Ave NE, 124th St NE, and Totem Lake Blvd, are four lanes; the majority of the arterials targeted as "Transit Corridors" have just two lanes, with few featuring even a median lane.</p> <p>Take Market Street as an example: what alterations are required to support an increased flow of people? In my 10-Minute Neighborhood along the Market Street corridor, where The Asian Wok/Market Grill once stood, eight townhouses are being built. I won't be dining at any of these townhouses. To enhance my quality of life, I require transportation options that extend beyond my ten-minute walk radius. The Market Street Neighborhood Plan, up for review at the 9/12/2024 Kirkland Planning Commission meeting, aims to preserve Market Street's tree-lined median. I urge the Planning Commission to provide specific, detailed plans: How do they intend to accommodate traffic lanes in each direction on Market Street for (1) vehicles; (2) Metro buses; (3) bicycles and other rolling experiences; (4) pedestrians and other mobility modes? While preserving the tree-lined median and dedicated turn lanes?</p> <p>For each proposed "Transit Corridor," I urge the Planning Commission to provide specific and detailed plans accounting for the proposed and varied modes of transportation while considering the proposed increased population density. This is a request for current, 2024 plans, not for the dreams of 2044. Otherwise, I ask the Planning Commission to include "unicorns" and "rainbows" in the Neighborhood Plans, the Land Use Plan, and the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. Because my dream of riding unicorns on rainbows over the proposed "Transit Corridors" seems just as plausible as anything detailed in the referenced plans.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>You have heard from the various neighborhoods in Kirkland regarding the 2044 Plan. Now is the time to remove the eight transit corridors from consideration. These proposed corridors are too large and too soon. We ask for transportation to be secured with proven adoption rates before taking on additional growth centers. The transit corridors are unnecessary for Kirkland to meet its mandated growth targets. If we hold our current course, we are on schedule to have excess housing capacity. Leave our Neighborhoods as Neighborhoods where families can enjoy the space. Do not allow such density on the corridors and infringe into our neighborhoods. Listen to the people who live here, have invested in Kirkland and want to keep Kirkland something to be proud of. STOP such corridor density</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed</p>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a voting resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm submitting written comment to the Kirkland Planning Commission on behalf of Housing Development Consortium ("HDC"). HDC represents 210+ members in the affordable housing sector who work hard to ensure that all people can live with dignity in safe, healthy, and affordable homes within communities of opportunity, like Kirkland. We have multiple members that operate their organizations out of Kirkland and other members that develop and operate affordable housing in and around Kirkland.</p> <p>We urge the Planning Commission to support a bold growth strategy in Kirkland that lays the foundation for affordable housing, transit-oriented development, and inclusive growth for current and future generations. More specifically, we support the intent of the proposed Comprehensive Plan Policy LU-2.4 that states: "create additional capacity for higher-intensity residential uses along identified frequent transit corridors citywide and ensure development regulations enable multi-unit housing types."</p> <p>On May 2nd, HDC joined a broad set of nonprofit and industry partners from the Eastside Housing Roundtable on a letter encouraging the City of Kirkland to ensure that the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan SEIS analysis is bold enough to consider a full range of viable transit-oriented growth options, including housing capacity over 50 du/acre near transit stops (up to 200 du/acre). This is because:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The foundation for affordable housing is residential capacity, in the form of adequate height and density—especially near transit. Capacity doesn't create affordable housing alone, but it is a necessary ingredient, especially when our region and state have a well-documented shortage of affordable housing that is most urgent at low-income levels.</li> </ul> <p>oTo leverage economies of scale, a certain base level of density is needed for projects to be feasible in the first place. Specifically, mid-rise construction is the most cost effective development type. By limiting density and height, we create a higher per-unit housing cost that then requires higher future rents or more public subsidies to compensate.</p> <p>oInadequate housing supply also causes rents and housing costs to rise. This shuts out workers (like nurses, baristas, janitors, teachers, etc.), young families, and many others who contribute to the current and future success of Kirkland. So, over time, adequate residential capacity can help Kirkland achieve its stated goal to be a safe, inclusive, and welcoming community for all people by creating more opportunities for housing at a range of affordable income levels near public transit.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Planning for denser housing near transit is a tool to foster a healthy, sustainable transportation system. This aligns with Kirkland's own vision statement that emphasizes a "community that is connected by local and regional transit services..." and where "jobs, services, and housing are clustered around routes and trails..."</li> </ul> <p>oAccording to the 2021 King County Urban Growth Capacity Report, Kirkland grew at 75% of the pace needed to achieve its 2035 housing growth target since 2006. This suggests that Kirkland can be bold in how it considers adding residential capacity to meet its growth targets in the planning period between 2019 and 2044. It's important to remember that this plan is not for today or even tomorrow; it is meant to help Kirkland plan for investments and growth for the next 20 years and beyond.</p> <p>oAs noted by Kirkland Staff in a memo from July 26th "it is considered best practice for cities to plan for housing capacity that exceed their growth targets." This is</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have been a proud Kirkland resident for 38 years. During that time I have paid taxes, supported local businesses, attended parent / teacher nights as a parent at Kirkland schools from 6th through 12th grades, and volunteered with a variety of organizations including Kirkland Downtown at the Lake back when they had work parties to spruce up Kirkland and other times installing Fourth of July decorations. This is the first time I have written to the council during all of those years. I am writing today because I am very disappointed in what I am seeing the Kirkland City government propose and how they are managing it. I have invested time to write this letter and am asking that you take the time to read and absorb what I am sharing. Are you aware of the city's calculated decision to not communicate with Kirkland's well-established neighborhood groups regarding the City's plans despite the fact those plans would create massive changes for those neighborhoods and their citizens' homes and quality of life? That deliberate action by the City has created a significant rift between the citizens and the city government. The extreme positions being proposed by City staff and the planning commission have brought the kind of divisiveness to Kirkland that is sadly so prevalent in national politics these days. That is an unwelcome change.</p> <p>Now is the time for discernment and wise decision making to keep the discourse and distrust from getting even worse. Extreme voices on the right and the left do not represent the views of most Americans, and yet the extreme voices have taken over the conversations. Do not fall into the trap of taking bad advice from radical ideologues. History is full of examples where government leaders followed advice from "experts" rather than citizens and the experts ended up being wrong. In so many of those cases, the collateral damage was severe. (Vietnam and the certainty that Saddam had weapons of mass destruction are notable examples.) To be perfectly clear, here are my thoughts regarding some of the current proposals being considered in Kirkland.</p> <p>The Growth Management Act Makes Us Do It- Hiding behind statements that Kirkland has to make radical planning and development changes to meet the Growth Management Act is not supported by the facts. Kirkland has exceeded the growth management targets time and time again without the massive changes being proposed.</p> <p>City Staff Knows Best-Kirkland residents are well educated and well informed. Intentionally leaving them out of the process and isolating the discussions to groups with narrow and extreme views is a mistake and leads to confirmation bias and group think. You have a duty to fix that. Kirkland residents should be the most important stakeholders. You represent them.</p> <p>Transit Corridors-I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Affordability: The density levels suggested in this plan will do nothing to lower the key cost drivers (construction, financing, interest carry, design and engineering, entitlement, regulatory costs, property taxes, operating costs) associated with residential development. Any suggestion that Kirkland's proposed comprehensive plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland is a false narrative. . Responsible Growth-Like many residents, I am concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. Future growth should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>There are plenty of tired class C retail centers with large parking areas that lend themselves to mixed-use residential development without removing existing <del>single-family housing</del>. <del>Some of those retail center properties are currently being redeveloped as apartments. Similarly, the office market is overbuilt, particularly</del></p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a Houghton resident, I fully reject the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering. One of the charms of Kirkland is being a suburban area, converting it into a dense urban area will negatively impact the current residents around the transportation corridors.</p> <p>In addition to Kirkland totally changing its character, the following issues come to mind:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* the density proposed in this plan is not proportional to the transportation infrastructure. Traffic is already terrible during morning and evening commute and it'll become way worse with the proposed increased density.</li> <li>* schools will be overcrowded, for example Lakeview is already overcrowded</li> </ul> <p>I implore you to vote in accordance with the will of the many taxpayers of Kirkland who live around the transit corridor area and oppose the proposed plan.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I ask that you reconsider the designation of transit corridors to define the city's growth plans. These traffic corridors are commuter bottlenecks that have very little to do with public transit. King County Metro and LWSD have consistently cut service over my last 20+ years on Finn Hill. In addition, the state of KC Metro stops are a mishmash of occasional shelters and single poles along busy streets. There is nothing attractive or inviting about riding transit in the area. How will this improve for new residents?</p> <p>School bus service is another issue contributing to our traffic issues. As an example, there was a high school stop within two blocks of my home in 2000. By 2014, my oldest walked an additional five blocks to reach the closest stop, and into an area still missing basic sidewalks today.</p> <p>Please do not call commuter corridors transit corridors, unless KC Metro &amp; LWSD are onboard to bring better service right now.</p> <p>City growth and infrastructure problems have been leapfrogging year over year. The tolling of the 520 Bridge is a clear example. Juanita Drive, Simmonds Road and Bothell Way have not been the same since tolling began over a decade ago. This combined with business and residential growth make the area far less attractive.</p> <p>High density building along with the rising cost of land and construction, will not equate to affordability. Quite the opposite. There is no affordable housing in our surrounding communities or western Washington. How will Kirkland's plans break this cycle?</p> <p>We cannot afford to blunder into new projects without key service upgrades. Kirkland is not meeting the needs of current residents and will not meet the needs of new residents. Do not go forward with more density as we struggle to navigate through the current infrastructure.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. The city of Kirkland has bigger issues, to be addressed, in order for Kirkland to keep being a desirable place to live. Listening to actual Kirkland residences vs. outside factions should be a priority. We live here and know best!</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Healthcare: Last summer, when I had to go to the ER, there was a 3 hour wait! I had to go to Redmond. Good thing I didn't have a heart attack!</li> <li>• Schools, class room size</li> <li>• Traffic and reckless driving have been out of hand and is only getting worse by the day.</li> <li>• Environmental impact on air quality, sewer, habit for wildlife, pollution in general (especially caused by extremely loud, gas powered lawn equipment, used by cheap maintenance crews) and trash/graffiti.</li> <li>• Crime: armed robbery, rape, car theft, mail theft</li> <li>• What we could use are community gardens, allotments/pea patches, more green spaces.</li> </ul> <p>And more smaller, single family homes that younger people can afford.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Build more housing near google, if needed. But it isn't needed, as there are more apartment buildings in construction all over Kirkland</li> </ul> <p>Long time Kirkland residence of over 35 years, tax payer, and registered voter</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As longtime Kirkland residents and business owners, my husband and I are writing this letter to voice our strong objection to the proposed transit corridors being considered to add to the Land Use portion of the Comprehensive plan. The most obvious reason for objecting to the corridors is that they would drastically transform the essential nature of Kirkland. It is a lovely, safe lakeside community with residents who have a great amount of pride and proprietary interest in maintaining its relatively peaceful, suburban feel. Our streets are not "corridors" they are part and parcel of our residential community, safe for walking children to and from school, walking pets and just walking for exercise or sheer pleasure.</p> <p>Secondly we already have a major north-south corridor in I-405, where those who want to travel that route by bus, which make use of HOV lanes, are already able to do so. However, as we have already learned, despite the availability of such service, Eastside residents prefer to travel by car, and the busses which already travel these north/south routes (including 108th Ave. NE) have operated with minimum occupancy for many years.</p> <p>Third, and often overlooked, is the issue of need. When discussing mass transit, one has to take into account origins and destinations. Traditionally, society has had a very clearly defined separation between residential and business areas. Those traveling from residential areas to business areas, primarily for employment, needed high capacity vehicles to take them, for example, from suburbs to metropolitan areas for jobs, shopping etc. Thus the reason for railroads to Long Island and Connecticut in New York City, taking workers from the burbs to Penn and Grand Central Stations. Also the reasons for subways in London, NY and Tokyo. This is not the case in our area. Many people travel from dense cities to suburbs for work, many work on staggered shifts and an increasing number work from home. It is the same with schools, especially high schools and colleges. Everyone has different schedules, and different transit needs. Many high school students have after school activities and few workers do a traditional 9-5 shift. College students often work their class schedules around part-time employment hours. For all of these reasons, people's preferences and needs no longer comport with the old paradigms of "commuting."</p> <p>In view of the above, plus the fact that the transit corridors are not required for Kirkland to meet it mandated growth targets, we believe that the proposed "corridors" are unnecessary and undesirable. We strongly suggest that the council study this issue closely in view of changes in residents' life and work styles, and draw up more appropriate and beneficial ways to spend taxpayer funds. The essential nature of Kirkland, the reason why people love to live and work here, is at stake</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, and share my opposition to including Transit Corridors in the Plan. I am a mother of 2 and an active volunteer. It is important to me that Kirkland is a diverse, welcoming, supportive community. I appreciate that we value planning for future growth and making living in Kirkland affordable, but I believe we also need to ensure the plan is feasible and done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure, and through a transparent process that involves the community.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. With our high land values, increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure &amp; Student Safety: The density being proposed is disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools. At Lakeview Elementary on 68th Street, we are at the largest numbers in years with over 600 students. The school building and outdoor spaces aren't large enough. This year, we converted the art room and multilingual rooms into classrooms, which not only degrades student learning opportunities during the school day, but also eliminates before and after school programs previously held in those spaces that are critical for working parents. Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should be planned together. The current approach seems fragmented, and needs to consider pedestrian safety, especially primary school aged children. There is growing traffic along 68th where K-5 students walk/bike to school and play in parks, not to mention the Middle school students who take the bus from Lakeview Drive.</p> <p>3. Transparency and Community involvement: As residents, we have lots to contribute and we deserve more engagement from the city. The communication from the city seems sparse. I appreciate the recorded videos and hope to make it in person to an upcoming meeting when the community is allowed to join. Thank you for reading. I look forward to your response. I'm also happy to meet in person and contribute</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Dear Governing Bodies-You are volunteering your time to do what you think is best for Kirkland. Based on the political moves over the last few years, it is getting hard to see that. I am wondering what is the driving force behind sweeping zoning changes in the Houghton and the 108th corridor. Starting with the sneaking abolishment of the Houghton Council by our past leader that moved to WA state government, the silent approval of the sale of LaQuinta to King County to changes the zoning all almost of Houghton; it is hard to believe that commissioners are working for the good of Kirkland. I too would like affordable housing on the eastside and particularly Kirkland which my children cannot afford to move back into. We have moved out of the area and had to shock of trying to move back in. I believe in affordable housing in theory but that is not how this really works.</p> <p>You are thinking that we can build affordable housing and it will help teachers, baristas, support workers. There is an expression follow the money. The developers and government that does not even know Kirkland that are vying for the great location and access to Houghton, Moss Bay and Everest areas are not altruistic. They will build lots of 5 story building with 1 to 2 units for low income or subsidized units. They do not have to build a building and then keep it section 8 housing. Developers know how to play the game and influence to get what they want. They have the money to hire influence and work the system for years. The average home owner does not. We have moved into and invested in a Kirkland that is residential and you are working to make it Urban. The 85th corridor is set up to expand build 5 story buildings. The 108th corridor is homes in neighborhoods. Our Eastside expansion will happen but we do not have to RIP APART existing neighborhoods.</p> <p>You appear to be apart of the delusion that these units are going to sell or rent below market pricing. Growth does not work that way. I wish. Maybe a few units will be available to lower income people but it will not bring my children back to this neighborhood and what is special about Kirkland will be destroyed. The only ones who benefit are the developers. Who is the council working for? Hard to tell.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have been a Houghton resident for 17 years. Thank you for accepting my comments about the proposed study for the Future Kirkland Plan. After attending the last chamber session, I feel my perspective was not fully represented in the public discussion, so I offer the following comments. I chose Kirkland and my house because of the walk score and the ability to walk to get coffee, dinner, or do simple errands. This was pre-Cross Kirkland Corridor, and the Spirit of Washington dinner train was still running. After the train stopped, and when the tracks were removed from our section of the trail, my neighbors and I got together, formed a work party, and built steps with a bike rail to replace a steep, often muddy cut-through. To support the development trail, we worked together to make the trail accessible to everyone. We love the trail and today, people drive into the neighborhood, park in front of our houses, and use the steps we built to access the trail. While we are proud of our contribution, and that we have contributed to keeping Kirkland a walking city. However, my neighbors and I have also seen firsthand how structural changes can influence the flow of people and traffic. In our once bucolic neighborhood, we now have traffic. Some of it is due to the trail, and while it is inconvenient, we don't mind because it contributes to making the trail available to everyone. However, most of the increased traffic is due to an increase in housing density. The truck traffic has grown because of the construction boom following recent zoning changes permitting multi-family dwellings on single plots. In my perspective, it does not seem that the city considered how the change in zoning regulations would impact traffic in individual neighborhoods. Today my neighborhood is currently struggling to accommodate these new traffic and parking patterns. I do not see the city of Kirkland engaged to study this and understand the impact that has already occurred with the first round of changes to zoning. I am worried that additional changes to the zoning which allows more density will bring further challenges to not only mine but to other Kirkland neighborhoods.</p> <p>I believe traffic flow and the movement of people are central to the issues we face in planning Kirkland's future. Kirkland should lead the way by proposing to study this issue. In my opinion, we must clearly understand how our public transportation infrastructure will support Kirkland's growth and how and where will Kirkland connect.</p> <p>I thought that with the 85th Street project, Kirkland had committed to supporting connections to the 405 corridor and the light rail system. However, the recent transformation of the Houghton Park &amp; Ride into a skateboard park and pickleball court seems to have radically shifted away from that commitment.</p> <p>We must ensure that Kirkland remains connected to broader transportation infrastructure, especially as the 85th Street and light rail projects progress. Before moving forward with the Future Kirkland Plan, we need to evaluate how current projects, like 85th Street, Bridal Trails, Totem Lake and Kirkland Urban, have performed and whether they are meeting our density and transportation goals.</p> <p>I urge the commission to collaborate with King County Metro and prioritize transit infrastructure to keep Kirkland a walking city. Please ensure that the city's growth supports both high- and low-density areas, with clear consideration for traffic, connectivity, and livability.</p> <p>Thank you for your time and for engaging in this important discussion</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My husband and I moved to Kirkland in 1981. As long time residents living at 5229 111th Ave NE, we have seen many welcome changes as Kirkland grows from a small eastside town to a busy eastside community. Along with this growth has come some unforeseen and unfortunate growth plans being considered with very little transparency. I am sure many of you will disagree with this statement but most of my neighbors in the Woodland Heights area of Houghton and friends who live in other Houghton neighborhoods were very unaware of anything as drastic as the rezoning of residential properties and the addition of transit corridors! I have been rereading minutes of meetings, listening to video clips from meeting and talking to other Kirklanders and want to keep this short so I will use bullet points.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transparency: We did not realize the full implications of what's in the works until the signs informing us that our residential neighborhoods would likely be impacted by the 4-6 story building zoning changes. It was a wake up call that we needed to become better informed and started looking for more information which led to the transit corridor plan. Most of my neighbors were unaware of all of this until mid-August 2024. I attended the July open house/ meeting about Houghton Center development and was under the impression that building height restrictions were subject to this area NOT our neighborhood!! When a friend I was attending this display with asked a traffic question about the traffic density around 68th and 108th, no mention was made of a "traffic corridor." I learned last weekend from people living along 108th that they were informed (by Metro??) of the issue as their properties were possibly going to be affected (by the widening of the road by 11-12 feet). Said girlfriend and I spent part of last Sunday on 108th between 53rd and 68th to see how many residences would be affected. It is significant. I also have learned that Metro has had a vision for these traffic corridors in Kirkland for several years. I know I heard the word "bus carve outs" in the past but that is not what I envisioned (or people I have talked to). Carve out implied bus stops carved out so loading and unloading did not effect traffic flow not more lanes.</li> <li>2. Timing: Last week I watched the city council meeting on line and appreciated allowing another week for comments from the community. As I said, I have done much catching up this week and definitely feel there is a need for MORE community input considering the implications for all of Kirkland! I listened to a planning commission role call and was heartened that a few said this addition to the comprehensive plan was moving too fast.</li> <li>3. Richard Carlson's letter was very thought provoking. The subject line (Overkill) says it all. He has a perspective from his experience in Palo Alto and information about how density numbers are interpreted. Moving too fast and overbuilding is a concern. The building of condos or apartments in residential neighborhoods seems like a land grab to me that developers could profit on over single houses on similar lots. I have noticed a new home with an ADU behind it on NE 49th in our neighborhood and apparently there is a plan for 4 homes on the teardown property on 108th and 60th. Both these indicate there already is a zoning change in place allowing for more density.</li> <li>4. What is reasonable: Increasing building density in already established areas with amenities already in place: Juanita Village, Kirkland Urban and Totem Lake. I have said enough. Take more time to consider what you are proposing. People obviously were unaware of the scope of changes taking place. Most thought Rapid Ride refers to the 85th project. I never thought "eminent domain" could come to our neighborhood or a 6 unit or more apartment building on our street!</li> </ol>
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</li> <li>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</li> <li>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</li> </ol>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Rodney, We go way back, and I am very familiar with your strongly held personal views, enough to know that LU 2.4 is "your baby". As proud co-founder of Liveable Kirkland you developed and introduced this very unpopular and controversial ½ mile wide Transit Corridor plan throughout Kirkland. Then, as Chairman of the Planning Commission, you have led the discussion and will be pushing this proposal through to a vote of the Planning Commission without public notification or transparency. Even those of us who have been working since very early last year on the Comp Plan feel blindsided by LU 2.4. It is because of this clear and obvious conflict of interest that I must insist that you and Commissioner Jacobson recuse yourself from voting on your pet project. Also, any Planning Commissioner whose family business would benefit from vastly increased density throughout the City should recuse as well.</p> <p>If not, then the integrity of the entire Planning Commission process will be called into question and the City of Kirkland should follow Mercer Island's lead and disband and reconfigure our Planning Commission. Maybe it is time to go to outside paid consultants to avoid even the appearance of impropriety.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The Land Use Element of the Comprehensive Plan (i.e. the 8 transit corridors that will be subject to upzoning) is expected to be discussed and voted on in tomorrow's Planning Committee Meeting.</p> <p>I would like to voice my concern and ask the Planning Commission to remove the eight transit corridors from consideration. These proposed corridors are too large and too soon. I ask for transportation to be secured with proven adoption rates before taking on additional growth centers. The transit corridors are unnecessary for Kirkland to meet its mandated growth targets. Thank you for time and attention to this matter.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Our family are long-term residents of Kirkland, we own and live in our family house on 11th Ave. We are asking the Planning Commission to remove the eight transit corridors from consideration. These proposed corridors are too large and too soon. We ask for transportation to be secured with proven adoption rates before taking on additional growth centers. The transit corridors are unnecessary for Kirkland to meet its mandated growth targets. If we hold our current course, we are on schedule to have excess housing capacity</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We reside in downtown Kirkland and have followed all the council meetings and discussions both on streaming and in person.</p> <p>We are opposed to the proposed establishment of transit corridors which allow density which we believe is beyond what is necessary to satisfy new density requirements.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	As a long-time Kirkland resident, I urge the city council to remove the transit corridors plan from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. The Kirkland constituents made many compelling arguments at the City Planning Commission and City Council meetings. Upon learning of the Transit Corridors Plan, I spoke with all of my Kirkland neighbors; most are outright surprised and upset. Kirkland will inevitably grow and I support healthy and smart growth for the city, but I am against growth without improving core infrastructure across Kirkland
9/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	High Density and transportation in Kirkland-As a Kirkland resident for 49 years, I vehemently opposed the higher density zoning proposed for Kirkland and the foolishly expensive, intrusive and unnecessary inclusion of transit corridor's on 108th Ave. in the comprehensive plan. Mr. Richard Carlson's letter "Overkill" explains exactly how I feel. Moreover, I will definitely be following the vote of the council members and will generously support candidates that oppose these extreme Kirkland proposals.
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	As owner of property in Houghton, I strongly oppose idea to widen 108 into Bus Expressway and allow higher building heights

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. What the Council is attempting to do is completely self-serving, greedy and downright ludicrous – and not in Kirkland residents’ best interests, nor what we are asking for. South Kirkland (108th/6th Houghton, specifically) cannot and should not be made to handle the massive change to its major street/thoroughfare – nor should we allow 4-6 story housing! WE SAY NO. I understand that the proposed land use plan allows rezoning of an enormous area, 1 mile across and 9 miles long. That is 9 square miles or over 6,000 acres. It allows rezoning from single family residential to 4-6 story multi-family 1/4 mile one each side of the two main north south corridors that extend the whole length of the city – which I understand could mean 100,000 potential net new units, or a new population of about 250,000, a total of 35 times the current population! Unacceptable. This amount of housing you would re-zone to allow is absurd in its sheer volume. There is no way to build “affordable housing” in this region, so all you are doing is increasing the pocketbooks of developers and builders – without considering the citizens who already live here. Kirkland has already allowed multi-story buildings in downtown areas – Kirkland Urban, Totem Village, to name a few – These are more than enough supply to both meet state standards and sharply slow the rise in rents. It also means a huge population increase; 20,000 more units means about 50,000 more people and 30,000 more cars, a 50% increase. I understand that growth and development is going to happen, However, a jump this huge in allowable zoning laws should not be made this quickly and drastically. I also understand that the land use plan does not change the zoning, it “only allows” re-zoning – but we know that is an open invitation to developers and builders, and there will be no stopgap with their deep pockets and penchant for litigation. I have been told that no other community in the nation has ever tried such a massive rezoning! We do not want to be the first. One of the more popular myths upon which the land use plan is based is that garage space will be unnecessary because the new occupants will all take the bus. This is a joke. Do you have a car? I do, as does my husband. When is the last time that you rode a bus to a kid’s soccer game, school pick up, the grocery store, or any other “mundane” daily task? It’s not going to happen, and we cannot sustain such a huge influx in the density to this area (or expect all the new people moving in to do so!) – which will inevitably add many, many more cars to the roads, despite a proposed increase in the number of buses and a dedicated bus lane. Neither the school system nor the transportation network could handle anything approaching these numbers. If you remember, we voted to maintain the Houghton Community Council for this exact reason – to keep the Kirkland Council in-check for our community, and now you are all at your sneaky ways again, trying to push through your own agenda without listening to those who live and vote here. I am a parent, board member, past PTSA president and lifetime resident of Kirkland. I am involved, civic-minded and I love this city! I am also a realist, and I understand that progress and growth happen, and we need to account for it – but this is NOT the way to go about it. This is a massive step too far, and we oppose the change in the rules that would allow something this drastic to happen in Kirkland. I urge you to please listen to the actual Kirkland citizens who live in the area where you are proposing this drastically change – WE DON’T WANT THIS. We will not strike down every proposal, but we are saying NO to one this drastic. While I write this, I hope it gets through to the City Council, as unfortunately I feel like you’ve already made up your minds, despite massive public outcry to the contrary. I know every single one of my Houghton neighbors (i.e. real-life residents, not those paid to stump for developers!) agree with me on this issue – the mass rezoning enabled by the new Land Use plan is ludicrous, unnecessary and not approved by Kirkland citizens who truly care about our town.</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</li> <li>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I’d like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</li> <li>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland’s natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</li> </ol> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city’s unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland’s future.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I grew up in Bellevue. My husband and I purchased our first home in Kirkland in 1984. We have moved twice, all within Kirkland because we love the wonderful neighborhood feel throughout most of the city.</p> <p>I am very concerned about the proposed comprehensive plan that is before the current planning commission. The city of Kirkland is forward thinking about planning for growth which is imperative but the current plan is not in the best interest of the people who live here now and future residents. I am extremely concerned about the rezoning in single family neighborhoods. Growth is necessary but it should not come at the expense and character of our great city. I believe growth is better when it's more circular around a core rather than linear. Kirkland has been creating these cores with Kirkland Urban, Totem Lake and to a lesser extent the Juanita area. Please reconsider this proposed Comprehensive Plan. It is not in the best interest of our city</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of Transit Corridors in the 2024 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I have lived in the same house for over 60 years. I have seen many changes and they have been manageable. This plan is outrageous and will change Houghton forever</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Is the high-density housing and transportation corridor proposal for 108th and 68th streets intended to have Kirkland become Redmond? Kirkland is an exceptional East-side community of character that has escaped the changes that have made Redmond and Bellevue urban centers without charm. Kirkland has retained the charm of a village while still allowing reasonable population growth and modernization. We believe the high-density and transportation proposal radically changes the character of the city, so loved by the greater majority of its citizens. It seems to completely exaggerate the goals of the Comprehensive Plan with no regard for the monumental effects on the personal lives of its loyal citizens.</p> <p>We strongly believe there are better ways to achieve housing and transportation growth while respecting the long history of the city and the people who formed it as well as those who enjoy living in present Kirkland. We also believe the Honorable Planning Commissioners and City Council Members have the resources to successfully satisfy the goals of the Comprehensive Plan while respecting the will of the people of Kirkland without the potential of a costly legal nightmare</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing regarding Draft Policy LU-2.4 of the proposed Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>For decades, Kirkland has been a leader in planning gracefully for growth. As we watch the developments downtown, at Totem Lake, along the 85th Street Corridor, at the Bridle Trails shopping area, and in our own neighborhoods, we see evidence of how the Planning Commission has steered Kirkland toward a path that fulfills the goals of the Growth Management Act.</p> <p>In 2020, many of our traditional assumptions were challenged by the global pandemic. As you know, many people (especially families with children) moved from densely populated urban centers to areas with more open space, and businesses learned they could function with some employees working remotely. Some of our higher educational facilities lost overseas students and have yet to see their numbers rebound. In other words, people are making different choices than in the past, and our future growth patterns might not mirror our past assumptions. One of the things we learned in the pandemic was that school children did not do well learning remotely; therefore, I think it's vitally important that we prioritize school locations and capacities (not just houses and jobs) when planning for future density. (Aside: wouldn't it be great if Kirkland became famous for how it prioritizes children!).</p> <p>For the reasons above: that Kirkland's current plan in working as expected, future growth assumptions may need to be adjusted, and school capacity is vital to our discussions about growth, I support decision path OPTION B: Consider a version of Policy LU-2.4 at a future date (not with 2044 Comp Plan). I know these are hard decisions, and I value your thoughtful discussions and consideration</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Planning Commissioners-The focus of this email is LU-2.4, the much discussed Transit Corridor section of the Land Use Element. Per the (September 12, 2024) meeting packet, it appears there are now five alternatives before you. That is a lot to sort through and process for interested residents like me — as well as for you I'm sure! I am not advocating for a particular alternative in this email. I am urging that whatever language you adopt, you take a long-range view of the implications. This is a plan for the next two decades! That said, here are some general points of advocacy:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Keep policy 2.4 in the Land Use Element. Do not eliminate LU-2.4 as some have advocated. Housing and transit are inextricably linked.</li> <li>2.Keep LU 2.4 language high level and concise, with clear intent that is transparent but not addressing every implementation detail at this stage. In other words, provide flexible guidance for exploration and study.</li> <li>3.Do not make the exploration of options contingent upon satisfying the 85th St. SAP "pioneer provision" or other prerequisites.</li> <li>4.The housing crisis is urgent and growing. We must not approach each solution serially but instead tackle many policy avenues in parallel.</li> <li>5.Do not incorporate specific building heights into the policies you adopt now. That is too constraining and should be left for the later stages.</li> </ol> <p>Thank you for all your painstaking work on the Comp Plan and your openness to public input.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am strongly against this 108th / 68th density corridor proposal. This plan will destroy the residential neighborhoods of Houghton and Everest Park in the name of the almighty dollar while creating environmental impacts such as increased traffic jams, emissions produced by tearing down homes and building 5-story housing — not to mention parking and noise issues. Most importantly, eminent domain could be employed to take away the homes of long-time residents in their senior years.</p> <p>The city would provide so-called market prices for eminent domain purchases. Of course, those dollars would not enable most seniors — like myself — to be able afford to remain in housing in Kirkland. The mortgage for my small, 1,000 square-foot 1975 home is paid off. The property will not be worth enough in an eminent domain case for me to remain in Kirkland or Bellevue or anywhere on the Eastside. So the City of Kirkland will choose to entirely uproot my life after 20 years in Kirkland and move outside the entire area.</p> <p>On behalf of all the seniors and families who may be unceremoniously uprooted, we say “No thank you to those City of Kirkland officials who are pushing this agenda in the name of the god of density.”</p> <p>Wake up, listen to your constituents, and kill this plan now!</p>
9/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The Houghton Neighborhood Association (HNA), on behalf of our membership, fully rejects the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering. We wish to register that we would like this transportation oriented development land use proposal removed completely from the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•We don't believe the density proposed in this plan is proportional to the transportation infrastructure.</li> </ul> <p>I live off of the 108th corridor, and every evening, especially in summer months, traffic is backed up for miles. When the slightest incident happens, it can take 30 min to go 2 miles. What happens with hundreds of more home in this stretch?</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•We do not see how the density suggested in this plan will reduce the cost of housing in Houghton.</li> <li>•Our neighbors do not want the potential for single family homes along 108th/Houghton Boulevard and ¼ mile east / west to be rezoned for residential mixed-use.</li> <li>•Our neighbors do not want 50-200 units of housing per acre.</li> <li>•We believe that emergency services will be hindered and schools overcrowded. We already face problems with overcrowding at Lakeview.</li> </ul> <p>The overcrowding at Lakeview is not ideal. We do not have an art class for our students because of the lack of classrooms. One year, maybe 5 years back, one</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Although my property appears to be unaffected by the planned increased density I am concerned for the residents as a whole. Allowing multifamily units on single family lots in areas that are not along busy commercial zoned corridors is not a reasonable plan for many reasons. The lack of parking, increased traffic on small back roads, lack of transit, are concerning. The fact that multifamily dwellings are not paying their share of infrastructure is another concern. I hope you consider keeping the density along the commercial corridors vs. In the small neighborhoods.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>With respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan, I would like to take a moment to discuss the concept of representative government in the United States. The concept is that citizens vote for candidates, and the winning candidates then represent the best interests of those citizens. That seems obvious, and yet it does not seem to be the way the City Planning Department and the majority of the City Council are thinking with respect to the proposed Comprehensive Plan. Imagine this. Imagine that thousands of activists from other cities, funded by developers, sent you mail urging you to allow developers to take millions of dollars from the bank accounts of randomly selected people living in 25% of Kirkland, and use that money to build high-density housing in that same 25% of Kirkland, turning a tidy profit. It's hard to believe you wouldn't think that was a ridiculous suggestion (apart from being illegal). And yet... That's exactly equivalent to what's being proposed by the Planning Department and by many people who don't live in Kirkland. Every building above the current height limit in a view area (which includes all of West of Market and all of Houghton from 108th to the lake—hundreds if not thousands of houses) will reduce the value of the houses it blocks by hundreds of thousands or even millions of dollars, as the developer extracts the value of the view from the current citizens and takes it for themselves. (And don't imagine those will be low-income housing; the purchasers will be wealthier than the current residents.) And even in non-view areas, the presence of 4 or even 6 story apartments will cast both literal and figurative shadows over the neighborhood, even apart from the impact of construction, and property values will drop. So the Comprehensive Plan literally proposes to allow developers to take vast amounts of money from random people in 25% of Kirkland for their own profit.</p> <p>Many years ago, Kirkland made a covenant with its citizens about the height limit, and many thousands of people trusted the City to keep its word. It is entirely fair to describe the proposed Comprehensive Plan as a betrayal of the citizenry you are sworn to represent, in favor of developers, non-resident activists, and people who do not live here but might do so one day. Worse, you know that you are not carrying out the will of the people, because if you thought you were, you would put something this important to a vote. Imagine that: You're clearly leaning to putting 25% of Kirkland in the position of losing a significant portion of their life savings at the whim of developers, and you don't think it's worthy of a vote. One wonders what would be worthy of a vote.</p> <p>The most puzzling aspect of this is why you feel it's important to increase the height limit along the Transit Corridors. It is the prospect of taller buildings that creates apprehension and potential financial loss for thousands of people. Activists have tried to portray this as a class struggle (they smear the people who are objecting as "wealthy"), but even ignoring that the people who would live in new apartments would work at Google and Microsoft and would be wealthy, I have yet to hear anyone object to more housing or apartments. What they appropriately object to is breaking the height limit. Preserve the height limit, and I think everyone would be okay with dense apartment blocks. And there is no question about whether that would allow for enough housing for any prospective size of Kirkland in the next decade or so (in fact, there'd be enough housing under the current plan, once again raising the question of who is pushing this and why, and the answer is cui bono—developers). It would make even more sense to continue to densify the City core and leave the Transit Corridors as they are, with up to quad residences per lot, thereby building true city-level density in the core, with the corresponding benefits (much of the Transit Corridors will lack adequately walkable services), while preserving the character of the communities and not making the currently terrible traffic a nightmare, but it is the clear betrayal of changing the height limit that reasonably most enrages people.</p> <p>I have yet to hear a compelling argument for increasing the height limit, or indeed for the entire plan. There are vague statements like "let's free housing" and</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to express my concern with the new Comprehensive Plan and would like you to reject the proposal for LU-2.4. I have been a homeowner in Houghton since 1991 and appreciated the prior opportunities to truly give input on the overall city Comprehensive Plans and the neighborhood plans as well. Most times we spent up to a year in many, many meetings reviewing options and helping to shape the plan. It felt like a collaborative process and so much time was devoted to listening to all involved. Why isn't this done anymore? What are the excuses for NOT including the neighborhoods? Who is it you are representing? This time around the process has been rushed and not enough time has been spent involving the neighborhoods and residents, as well as truly studying the massive impacts LU-2.4 could have on residential neighborhoods. I feel that planning for future growth and more density is a good idea, but you are going from 25 mph to 200 mph overnight. Since the city is already on track to meet our housing goals, let's work forward in incremental steps and focus the higher density in the areas that are already slated for it. If you truly DO NOT intend to allow 4-6 story buildings in another 25% of Kirkland's neighborhoods, then I'm asking you to spell it out in better detail in this new Comprehensive Plan, so zoning will follow your intent. Why would Kirkland feel the need to surpass a lot of Seattle's zoning for single family zoning?</p> <p>By my calculations, my current lot could now have 3 homes on it, or potentially 17 with this new plan. This is an absolutely massive change that I believe many current homeowners in Kirkland would be saddened by.</p> <p>My reasons I ask you to reject LU-2.4</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Current zoning is already meeting our stated unit goals so we shouldn't be proposing to rezone so much of our residential neighborhoods</li> <li>2. New zoning for cottages and ADU's and DADU's is helping to add middle housing across the city (but keeps heights with-in standard residential heights)</li> <li>3. The proposed wording is too vague regarding height and number of units per acre</li> <li>4. For this vast of a change, more time should have been spent getting input from residents and neighborhood AND impact studies should have been done to look at traffic, emergency services, schools, and other impacts</li> <li>5. This proposal will not necessarily make homes and condo's more affordable since we have such high average incomes here and such high demand. Builder's try to maximize their income and build to the highest produce in demand</li> <li>6. Consider how Redmond has had so much growth, but has been able to keep their multi-family clustered together, and residential zoning as is</li> <li>7. In Redmond, just because they have drastically increased their density, it hasn't necessarily equaled lower or affordable housing costs</li> <li>8. IF the City of Kirkland wants truly affordable housing, that must be mandated to get it built</li> </ol> <p>I appreciate this opportunity to share my opinion with you.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Mayor Curtis, I am offended that at tonight's Council meeting you labeled some speakers at tonight's Council Meeting as "no growth" - towards people who are concerned that the current version of the Comprehensive Plan will primarily benefit developers and realtors, harm Kirkland residents, and do little to achieve affordable housing goals.</p> <p>We are not anti-growth. We want growth policies that have demonstrable proof that they can achieve the housing goals without degrading our city services and our quality of life. Instead, we see policies based on ideology and an insufficient Environmental Study.</p> <p>I do not feel you are being inclusive of residents who are asking you to take into account our requests for a comprehensive plan that is based on better data and achievable goals. I feel dismissed and talked down to. Although I missed my opportunity to speak virtually tonight due to a temporary loss of internet connection, your biased language leads me to conclude that I would not have been heard.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My husband and I are concerned and confused after hearing Councilmember Falcone state at the meeting last night that there is widespread community support for the proposed transit corridors. After witnessing the widespread opposition to it the past few months, it very much feels like some members of the council are very out of step with the community or are willing to push their own agendas instead of representing their constituents.</p> <p>I have seen members of the KDA, Kirkland Chamber, Holy Family Church, St. Johns, realtors, residents and business owners wearing blue at meetings in opposition to the comp plan. The majority of the supporters are not even residents. They are outside interest activists groups, lobbyists and non-residents who crash our city meetings.</p> <p>This point of view is tone deaf and alienates everyone who actually lives and votes here. And please remember: People live here. The proposed transit corridors aren't just some abstract idea. The reason for the outrage all across Kirkland is that the commission is actually trying to change the very lives of over 30% of Kirkland residents by changing the character and safety of their streets for the worse. If any council members support the transit corridors, then we challenge you to support these changes on your own street.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a Houghton resident and totally support the email letter sent to you by the HNA on August 22nd on behalf of those of us who live in this area. Please do not exacerbate the traffic congestion which already exists at this intersection by increasing the density</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My family and I have been proud voting resident of Kirkland for over 14 years, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents.</p> <p>We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland for 38 years, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the citizens. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As an 18 year Kirkland resident with children in LWSD and working Registered Nurse, I am writing to fully reject the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering. The important character and liveability in Kirkland have only diminished over more recent years with increasing the population dense high rise housing and no traffic or parking revisions to support these. Kirkland is becoming more and more like high-rise dense Redmond and Bellevue and less like the tight knit lakeside community that has attracted its residents.</p> <p>I would like this transportation oriented development land use proposal removed completely from the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Dozens of our neighbors have sent in written testimony to you, and others have expressed their unhappiness with this plan to us. Many of the neighbors have attended the planning commission meeting and have purchased signs in their yards registering their opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not see how the density suggested in this plan will reduce the cost of housing in downtown Kirkland and Houghton.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want the potential for single family homes along 108th/Houghton Boulevard and ¼ mile east / west to be rezoned for residential mixed-use.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want 50-200 units of housing per acre.</li> <li>• I don't believe the density proposed in this plan is proportional to the transportation infrastructure.</li> <li>• I believe that emergency services will be hindered and schools overcrowded. We already face problems with overcrowding at Lakeview and at LWHS.</li> <li>• I would like to see Metro Bus Service on 108th connect to meaningful destinations for our neighbors to increase ridership before considering land use decisions related to ridership</li> <li>• I and so many believe transportation and land use decisions are tightly related and should not be considered or decided with a flawed, siloed approach like this.</li> <li>• I believe this type of policy and subsequent zoning will be harmful to the environment</li> <li>• HNA as well as Highlands neighbors would like to be engaged and involved by the City in public transportation solutions for our neighborhood</li> </ul> <p>I implore you to vote in accordance with the will of the majority of taxpayers of Kirkland</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First of all I do want to note that we appreciate the Commissions effort and time spent on this very important and life changing proposal. I have attended most open meetings and they are quite the marathon!</p> <p>There are many topics to address in Kirkland's sweeping growth proposals. We are very dismayed by the (over)ambitious development of the smaller neighborhoods. Our house in Houghton is right off of 108th. The traffic at peak times is substantial, this road is not meant to be a main thoroughfare or transit expressway. If you look inside the buses going back and forth right now you will notice that they are always pretty much empty. An additional lane just for Metro is unnecessary and so disruptive to this small neighborhood.</p> <p>I understand and agree with the need for growth, planned growth, but multi storied buildings and a transit lane on 108th are overkill. The Houghton plaza redevelopment makes sense for some mixed used buildings, and there are more and more ADUs and such going up around us (yes the construction noise is a tedious 6 day a week, 8 hours+ a day onslaught but that's another topic). So the growth is happening but this proposal seems extreme for what Kirkland needs and can handle. At the end of the day, most of the residents here live in homes in neighborhoods because we wanted a home in a neighborhood. Not downtown density or waterfront condos. We need a growth plan that is not at the expense of what makes our Kirkland neighborhoods so great.</p> <p>PLEASE PLEASE do not go down the path of destroying 108th with an unnecessary bus lane. It's not a solution just an expensive dismal band-aid.</p> <p>If you are available for a phone call this coming week I would very much like to discuss this and hear more of your thought process on this matter.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to fully reject the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering. The important character and liveability in Kirkland have only diminished over more recent years with increasing the population dense high rise housing and no traffic or parking revisions to support these. Kirkland is becoming more and more like high-rise dense Redmond and Bellevue and less like the tight knit lakeside community that has attracted its residents.</p> <p>I would like this transportation oriented development land use proposal removed completely from the Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>Dozens of our neighbors have sent in written testimony to you, and others have expressed their unhappiness with this plan to us. Many of the neighbors have attended the planning commission meeting and have purchased signs in their yards registering their opinion.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• I do not see how the density suggested in this plan will reduce the cost of housing in downtown Kirkland and Houghton.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want the potential for single family homes along 108th/Houghton Boulevard and ¼ mile east / west to be rezoned for residential mixed-use.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want 50-200 units of housing per acre.</li> <li>• I don't believe the density proposed in this plan is proportional to the transportation infrastructure.</li> <li>• I believe that emergency services will be hindered and schools overcrowded. We already face problems with overcrowding at Lakeview and at LWHS.</li> <li>• I would like to see Metro Bus Service on 108th connect to meaningful destinations for our neighbors to increase ridership before considering land use decisions related to ridership</li> <li>• I and so many believe transportation and land use decisions are tightly related and should not be considered or decided with a flawed, siloed approach like this.</li> <li>• I believe this type of policy and subsequent zoning will be harmful to the environment</li> <li>• HNA as well as Highlands neighbors would like to be engaged and involved by the City in public transportation solutions for our neighborhood</li> </ul> <p>I implore you to vote in accordance with the will of the majority of taxpayers of Kirkland</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I watched on line the public testimony at the City Council meeting this past evening. Per Council procedure on public input, the Mayor called upon sets of 3 people each and proceeded to rotate among those who support incorporating the study of higher density development along numerous transit corridors in the revised 2044 Comprehensive Plan, and those who oppose it.</p> <p>When it was evident that there were a lot more folks there to testify against adding the transportation corridor density study to the comp plan, Mayor Kelli Curtis noted that there were just a few more pro high density corridors advocates yet to speak, and many others opposed, and she then cut off further testimony. While I can see that at some point there is redundancy that doesn't serve the Council, or the public attendees, I was very alarmed that Mayor Curtis suggested that of the two sides of the issue, that one side was the "affordable housing" side and the other the "no growth" side.</p> <p>I, and am sure many others, take great exception to those of us who oppose the comprehensive plan update adding a wholesale 1/2 mile wide swath of transportation corridors across the City to study high density housing across some 25% of the city as lumped into a group and termed to be "no growthers", or automatically translate that many of us who are concerned about wholesale density changes are also opposed to adding any more affordable housing units with our community for that matter.</p> <p>I would submit that many of us that are opposed to the high density upzoning potential and comprehensive plan inclusion of various transportation corridors across much of our City are not "no growth". Instead, we want the City to focus on sustainable, incremental and manageable growth measures that can be accommodated by our transportation systems, schools, parks and recreation, health care and other City services and other factors that must be addressed when considering additional city growth and higher densities.</p> <p>We want the City to prioritize placing higher density housing in areas of the City that have already been identified for that type of growth in past Council actions including Downtown Kirkland, the 85th Street Corridor/I-405 Intersection, Totem Lake, Juanita Village, etc.</p> <p>Some other potential areas for higher density growth could also include the Kingsgate Retail Complex and the QFC Complex on Juanita Drive which have been identified by some of the neighborhood groups (which by the way should be the focus of the City seeking further input and dialogue). But to amend the comprehensive plan to "study" a 1/2 mile swath of potential high density development across numerous transportation corridors involving some 25% of the City, and the resultant great potential for impact on existing and vital residential neighborhoods across our City is excessive and uncalled for, and should not be part of the City's blueprint plan for the next 20 years.</p> <p>In fact, most of us "no growthers" are fully resigned to the fact that the City needs to work toward the City's growth management targets of 34% growth or an additional 13,200 housing units over the next 20 years. That is NOT no growth! In fact, that is considerable new growth within a community that has already seen substantial growth in recent years. It will be hard enough to reach those growth targets and still maintain community character and livability without adding more provisions that would accommodate an even higher level of growth than what the growth management numbers already mandate.</p> <p>The record should be set straight. Most of us want sound, sustainable and incremental growth that is balanced with the improvements needed to accommodate that growth, while keeping the high quality of life in our cherished Kirkland community as much as possible.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a long time voting resident of Kirkland , Id like to express to you that I am against the current growth plan. I hope you will consider your fellow Kirkland residents and include us in the decision process. I am all for growth in logical areas of Kirkland where infrastructure can support the growth. It feels to myself and many of my voting neighbors, that the council is being influenced by organizations with agendas not concurrent to those of Kirkland residents. Please consider everyone in this community and move slowly and logically.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing regarding the proposed land use plan as a concerned Kirkland resident. While I fully support the need for thoughtful development, the current proposal far exceeds what is necessary or sustainable for our community. Kirkland's success has naturally led to increased demand for housing, but we must address this demand without sacrificing the qualities that make Kirkland such an attractive and livable city. Furthermore, it's very sad to see that this proposal isn't working to make our community stronger and more welcoming, , but rather, its far-reaching approach is tearing us apart.</p> <p>Guiding Responsible Growth: Kirkland's housing affordability issue is a consequence of its success. The city's proximity to major job centers, combined with its excellent schools, parks, and diverse neighborhoods, naturally makes it a desirable place for high-income workers. However, the proposed plan's sweeping upzoning, allowing for 4-6 story buildings across nearly 9 square miles, threatens to drastically and unnecessarily reshape our community, potentially leading to a decline in livability. There is already enough rezoning in place to meet the state's housing goals. Adding an additional 100,000 potential units, which would triple Kirkland's population, far exceeds the city's needs. This massive scale is unprecedented and unnecessary.</p> <p>Ensuring Adequate Infrastructure: Transportation is the ultimate limiting factor for any new housing development. Kirkland's current infrastructure is already struggling, with gridlock occurring regularly. Adding 30,000 more cars from already approved zoning changes will only worsen this. The proposed land use plan will push Kirkland's transportation and school systems to a breaking point, with no clear solutions. We cannot responsibly increase density without ensuring our roads, transit, and schools are adequately prepared for such growth.</p> <p>Promoting an Open and Transparent Process: While city staff may claim that the proposed land use plan merely "allows" rezoning, it's clear that once this plan is approved, developers will quickly file rezoning requests that the city will struggle to deny. This sets a dangerous precedent, giving developers the legal upper hand and leaving residents with limited recourse. Transparency and citizen engagement must be prioritized in these decisions. Kirkland residents should not live in fear that their neighborhoods will be drastically altered by developments that do not align with the city's vision or its current infrastructure capabilities.</p> <p>In summary, I urge you to reconsider the scale of this proposed plan and to prioritize responsible growth. We all want to address housing affordability and ensure Kirkland's future remains bright, but this plan risks doing more harm than good. Let's focus on responsible growth, build on the existing zoning, and ensure that our infrastructure can support any new development without overwhelming our community. I appreciate your consideration of these concerns.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a long-time resident of Kirkland and I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>1. Responsible Growth:</b> It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</li> <li><b>2. Adequate Infrastructure:</b> The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</li> <li><b>3. Transparent Decision-Making:</b> Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future. This proposal seems to be more about developer profits than the concerns of the people who live in Kirkland. Is this really what the people of Kirkland want? Affordable housing is not why I live in Kirkland. That may sound bad but is most likely the truth of most residents in Kirkland. How would you like to have an apartment building next to your house and have no parking available in your neighborhood. Might as well live in capitol hill neighborhood. I guess maybe I don't get it. I don't see where this makes Kirkland anything but a worse place to live. I don't see new multiple family housing going in next to Bill Gate's house anywhere in the planned future. Maybe the uber rich are the only ones that are immune to this type of planning. All the new apartments and condos under construction should be enough crowding in Kirkland for a long time to come. Forcing longtime residents to have to use public transportation does not sound like where I want to live in the future.</li> </ol>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/9/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing regarding the transit housing corridor being proposed, and changes to the zoning to allow more dense housing which hopefully includes some more affordable housing. Cost of housing, both to own, and to rent is getting way out of control, and something needs to change. I am fortunate that I bought my house 12 years ago as today, even at my salary which is higher than the average, I would not be able to afford it. I honestly don't know how people can afford to get into the home market now. Also, I've had neighbors get priced out of their properties and had to sell. I jokingly tell people that we will all soon qualify for affordable housing at the rate things are going. I don't want to see Kirkland become an enclave just for the rich and wealthy.</p> <p>I am in support of the transit corridor project, but I would really like the city to put the pressure on King County Metro and Sound Transit to reevaluate transit services and focus more on getting people from the home to their destination, especially major hubs like Redmond, downtown Bellevue, and Seattle. For example, we have a lot of people in Kirkland that work at Microsoft and tech companies nearby. For me, driving takes approximately 10 minutes. I once used metro, and it took me 2 hours in one direction.</p>
9/8/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a Kirkland resident, I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/8/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I hope you will consider my perspective and will enjoy my doodle below.</p> <p>Humanity First: A Place That Feels Like Home.</p> <p>I am not ultra wealthy, I'm not wealthy at all. However, I'm rich, not in money, but fulfilled by a meaningful life. I've lived in the same Kirkland neighborhood for 46 years. I know my neighbors, kids ride bikes, I borrow cups of sugar, we have conversations. Streets are quiet, birds are singing. I feel safe walking. The ambiance and enjoyment of a place matters. I remember Juanita Beach when it was wild and Kirkland when it was quaint. From small businesses to the antique mall to the book store with a cat in the window, Kirkland was friendly.</p> <p>I'm an elder and not yet retired. I've paid years of property taxes and countless levies. I vote. Anyone in city government interested in my perspective? I had a private meeting with a city councilman who was so intent on pushing his agenda that he never asked about mine. He suggested that I could ride a scooter or a bike on Juanita Drive to get to where I need to go. Elders riding bikes on Juanita Drive? He verified that Michaels, the craft store, will be torn down, replaced with a bland look-alike seven story building. I'm not the only resident shocked by such a decision. Traffic will increase, wet lands will be impacted and the sky will be blocked from view.</p> <p>I support reasonable growth. I do not support elders being pushed aside and disrespected. I support affordable housing for those who work in Kirkland. I do not support cookie cutter buildings with balconies too small to stand on. I support change that happens thoughtfully, slowly, wisely, carefully. I support neighborhoods that promote well being and natural environments conducive to ease and a meaningful life for all. I support environments that lift humanity up. Graphic doodle included in Pdf version of comment</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/8/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>For the record, I am a long-time Kirkland resident having moved to Rose Hill in 1966 and then to Norkirk in 1971. Over the years I've been immensely happy living in the City of Kirkland and especially in the Norkirk neighborhood. I've mostly felt that the city is responsive to the citizens and has worked to align city goals with the needs and desires of the various neighborhoods. To my mind, the individual neighborhood designations of the various parts of the city continue to provide a small town feel in spite of Kirkland being so closely positioned near a large city. However, there's also a constant push for development which can be distressing and which threatens to overrun the sense of community which has been a priority in the past. As an owner of an older home, very few days go by without offers to buy my home in order to tear it down and build a bigger, "better", and more dense replacement. I've been watching the signs pop up about the planning changes in the Comprehensive Plan that could lead to extremely high density around and near my home and my past experience suggests that being given even a small crack in the door will lead to developers jumping in with both feet and overrunning our neighborhoods before we residents even know what's happening.</p> <p>I share the concerns of my neighbors and am asking that some brakes be applied to the current very broad land use designations in LU 2.4. As written, this policy appears to provide that crack in the door which could easily lead to developments that totally destroy the neighborhood feeling I've come to cherish over the years. Although I recognize that additional zoning and planning would be needed before implementing actual changes, there's nothing to stop the builders from buying up multiple properties betting on big gains in the future. Along with that could easily come pressure on the city to get their desired zoning allowances and, as is often the case, possibly achieve their goals only because resident awareness had died down. My feeling is that this is much too BIG a change in Land Use design to implement in one fell swoop. I'd like to see this particular element removed from the Comprehensive Plan until it can be studied in more detail with much more input from residents. If it does remain, I strongly believe it needs much more further fine tuning if we are to have any hope of keeping our neighborhoods in tack. Thanks for your consideration</p>
9/8/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We are residents of Kirkland. We are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, we ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/8/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. You are here representing us and hearing us right?</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. I am curious to hear who are the proponents for this plan? Do they live here? Who are the ones sending emails asking you to move forward on this plan? Lobbyist? Actual residents? I'd like to better understand. Growth is already here and coming as we implemented the Missing middle housing plan and rezoning. I see cottages, ADU, DADA, carriage and two/three unit homes now making a home in the Kirkland area. This is continuing and has not slowed down. Already I'm seeing the traffic impact, flow of cars parking on the neighborhood streets. This has already changed the ways of Kirkland but still maintains the character and family lifestyle of the area. This style of growth seems adaptable but we are still learning. Now, are we looking to do MORE? I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a longtime resident of Kirkland, I am dismayed to hear of the proposals in the 2044 plan that aim to markedly reshape our community, to create mixed zone housing in single family neighborhoods, to drastically increase density with little plan to address an influx of cars on our neighborhood streets and impacts on our schools. I am not against development. I love the Totem Lake development. My adult son, handicapped and in a wheelchair, lived there for over a year. When you are in a wheelchair, you want to do as much as you can without getting into a car. Totem Lake is perfect for this. He could leave his apartment and go to a movie, the store, coffee, restaurants, clothes shopping – everything within one block. Even medical care was right there! The one thing it wasn't was affordable... he is on disability and so after a period of time he moved out. In every other way it was perfect; one of his caregivers even took the bus to the large transit center there. If the goal of the 2044 plan is to increase housing, reduce costs, and avoid needing cars, developments like Totem Lake, and what Redmond and Bellevue are doing, are perfect. They are clustered developments with high density housing, immediately adjacent to major freeways or transit (light rail) and the high density allows the retail to build around them and be successful. The current proposal of transit corridors will not achieve this goal. Random buildings within neighborhoods that are possibly 6-7 blocks from any particular retail or other services are not walkable. There is no way that my son would be able to live in an apartment in the middle of a 'transit corridor' in Houghton that is maybe a 3-4 block walk to one expensive grocery store and almost nothing else. No-one is going to walk 4 blocks in the rain in the dark or gloom to get their groceries. There are no entertainment services. There are no retail stores for clothing, books, gifts, toys, etc. Sporadic haphazard density in neighborhoods won't be sufficient to generate volume for retail density required for the goal of 'car free transit'. It is very hard for me to imagine that these small boutique dense apartments in the middle of neighborhoods are going to be inexpensive. Builders can create cheaper apartments when they build at huge economies of scale (like you see in Totem Lake.) Small buildings in the middle of neighborhoods will be expensive, and likely have the words 'Luxury' in the marketing materials which is all I see in front of every new development that lines Market Street. Kirkland is currently building an immense amount of new housing. The 85th street area is as yet totally undeveloped, and has the opportunity to be a second Totem Lake, right next to a major freeway, bus route, etc. Infrastructure for grocery stores and retail are already there. We haven't yet seen if all the new housing going in everywhere in our vicinity (Kirkland, Redmond, Woodinville etc) is going to all be filled. I don't see why we are in a rush to approve a very risky zoning plan, that hasn't been done elsewhere, and that our neighboring communities are not adopting. I feel like we can wait on this, to continue to gather community feedback, to give the current development time to complete and see where we are. Finally, I mentioned before that I am a long time resident of Kirkland. We chose to live here because of the charm of the community, the wide streets, the kids riding bikes, the parents pushing strollers. Whether you live in Market area, Houghton, Kingsgate, Bridle Trails, you see these same features of the town. I personally live outside of the transit corridor proposals but I am still vehemently against them. I have never in my life, for any cause, put a sign in my yard, but I have one against this proposal. I have noticed, driving around town, in different neighborhoods, not in public right of ways but in front of people's private homes, many many many blue signs. Perhaps you drive around the neighborhoods and see them as well. I have yet to see one sign FOR this proposal. I see many signs against this proposal in front of homes that again are not in the transit corridor. I have yet to see a sign in anyone's yard showing they are FOR this. It appears that many current residents do not like this plan. And for all the reasons I've mentioned above, there are very good reasons why. This plan will increase density, for sure, but there is no reason to believe it will be either affordable or reduce car use, <u>two stated goals of the 2044 Transit Corridor plan. Please listen to your townspeople and vote No or Not Yet on the transit corridor plan. It needs a lot more</u></p>
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li><b>Responsible Growth:</b> It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</li> <li><b>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland.</b> With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</li> <li><b>Adequate Infrastructure:</b> The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</li> <li><b>Transparent Decision-Making:</b> Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</li> </ol>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas and <b>WOULD ALSO LIKE TO REQUEST A COPY OF TRAFFIC STUDIES FOR ALL PROJECTS UNDER CONSIDERATION.</b> Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents.</p> <p>We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. If high density housing actually worked to lower housing costs and curtail car use it should be very easy to point to various place in Washington State that have had success with such plans. You can't... because proposals to change zoning laws in various neighborhoods in Seattle have NOT worked out as planned. And some neighborhoods that are already very dense with huge apartment buildings have built even larger buildings with less spaces for cars and the result has been disastrous! In a few cases you might say... well we don't yet what will happen. Then when and if it works....figure out the right proposal for Kirkland. We are not Redmond. ( We won't know for years if any of it works in Redmond and you know what the rents are there? NOT affordable.) You want Kirkland to look like Redmond? Move to Redmond then.</p> <p>Believe me I want affordable housing and as the owner of BookTree the only new and gently used bookstore in the area I wouldn't mind more people either. But this is NOT how to do it. You don't destroy what makes Kirkland.... Kirkland and expect it to work out.</p> <p>Pretending that changing zoning to allow multi-unit construction in high-priced residential areas (where people are paying lots of taxes) will provide lower cost housing ignores that building costs are very high and no one has a formula to build apartments and then lose money by having affordable rent. Landlords want to make money.... not lose money. What deals will you cut with developers and landlords that don't properly look after our tax base? Is there enough infrastructure in terms of sewers, garbage, recycling, water, electricity use etc.? Ruining neighborhoods with dense multi-units is not what current house owners or most residents want. Short of creating Section 8 type housing there is no doable solution to lowering costs of living in this area. It's difficult to provide places for homeless and poor people in the area.... nobody is going to be very happy with Section 8 projects.</p> <p>Rent control would also be very complicated though that might be explored. Pretending that bus lines will be altered to accommodate new construction plans is putting carts before horses and ignoring how things work in terms of transportation services. Thinking that people will give up cars if they don't have places to put them and will ride buses isn't something that people wind up doing. If you build cheaper housing within a few blocks of light rail and offer some sort of rent control and somehow avoid section 8... you MIGHT have something.....but expecting major changes in transportation routes (that take years to change) because a few large apartment complexes go up is crazy. Please don't conduct ill suited experimental solutions at the expense of our community. By the way our population is aging... and creating buildings that require living on multi-levels is not very smart either.</p>
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing a further testimony to you, supporting the views expressed by HNA and others over our unhappiness with this stage of presentation of the Comprehensive plan for City of Kirkland as it impacts Houghton.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The ambition to 'reduce the cost of housing in Houghton' is admirable but not achievable at current and likely future land prices. There high global demand for this relaxed and highly liveable district that will not be satisfied by more 'cheaper housing' which the market continues to bid up beyond current \$650 per s ft.</li> <li>•We neighbors do not understand the thinking in the plan that higher density of family homes will meet future demand in premium areas of Eastside along 108th/Houghton Boulevard and ¼ mile East / West by rezoning for residential mixed-use.</li> <li>•While it s profitable for the construction industry to want 50-200 units of housing per acre, such concentration would require taxpayer investment in infrastructure which will likely increase our taxes to provide increased emergency services support and an increase in educational investment when surrounding areas are seeing reductions in enrollment. We already face problems with overcrowding at Lakeview.</li> <li>•The Plan calls for increases in Metro Bus Service on 108th to feed ridership. Since most travel will likely remain by car or other personal transport (in good weather!), few new destinations for our neighbors to increase ridership as anticipated under the plan as 'Hub and Spoke' routes are necessary and increase journey times. Where is the 'point to point' volume anticipated in new ridership going to come from?</li> <li>•We believe transportation and land use decisions are tightly related. Consideration of these points seems to be lacking in the Plan.and should not be considered or decided with a fragmented approach. An improvement to the approach would be to encompass a Vision for delivering a premium environment for current and future residents.</li> <li>•Houghton residents feel deeply about the way our neighbourhood develops. We want to contribute to the region's success as responsible custodians of the future of the neighbourhood. We want a Plan that maintains the delightful location and neighbourhood we have built.</li> </ul> <p>The Plan as presented needs our engagment and support. We urge that the Ciy's elected representatives involve HNA as continuity with the past to enable full support for the Plans' execution of housing, offices and public transportation developments for our neighborhood. I implore you to vote in accordance with the will of the majority of taxpayers of Kirkland.</p>
9/7/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to emphasize that while compliance with Washington state laws is essential, we should not feel compelled to yield to pressures from King County if they do not align with our community's best interests. It is crucial that the City Council prioritize our community's needs and resist external pressures that are not grounded in specific legal requirements or community benefits.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Urbanization along transport corridor is a rushed idea without proper traffic or environmental study. How can you include this in a comprehensive plan and commit to king county about it? I request this to be removed from comprehensive plan and be added to plan only after proper studies are performed.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have very serious concerns about the plan to significantly increase allowable density along transit corridors. The main objective of this increase in densification is to address housing affordability crisis. Yet, plan fails to provide any empirical data justifying that this objective is achievable. The simplistic assumption that increase in supply of housing units will automatically lead to reductions of rents or property values does not take into account real world data. There is plenty of evidence that in high demand areas such as Kirkland, densification does not lead to affordability improvements due to effect of global market forces. A few examples: 1) Vancouver BC where despite huge increase in density housing remains extremely unaffordable 2) Toronto Ontario where significant portion of new constructions catered to high - end market 3) San Francisco is a prime example of how density does not have simple relationship with affordability I think there is a significant risk to worsen quality of live of all Kirkland residents with this aggressive plan due to lack of proper infrastructure to accommodate it. The plan needs to align with investments into transit system, road network, schools etc. to have reasonable probability of success.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p> <p>I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>It is very naive to think that the increase density is going to result in affordable housing. We all know that the any new construction in the city of Kirkland is not going to be affordable simply because the cost to acquire land is so high and add the construction cost to that.</p> <p>I have closely followed the comments at the council meetings and public hearing. I have not heard a single resident come out in favor of the transit corridor. I am shocked that the Mayor is misleading the residents, who may not be following proceedings as closely as a few of us and stating that there has been support for the Transit corridor plans. This is a straightforward tactic to disinform the public and undermine our legitimate concerns.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My comments in opposition the city's Comprehensive Plan for 2-24, particularly LU 2.4 I do not see how the level of density suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. From the residents comments during the council meetings and public hearings, it is obvious that</p> <p>We residents are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. We do not support proposals for 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. We believe the proposed density is not proportional to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increasing density could strain emergency services and overcrowd schools, which are already facing capacity issues in some parts of the city. We'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect Kirkland residents to meaningful destinations before making major land use decisions based on ridership assumptions. Transportation and land use decisions are interconnected and should not be made in isolation, as this current approach seems to be. We are concerned that this plan, and the zoning changes it suggests, could have harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. We would like to see more engagement from the city and greater involvement from the community in shaping public transportation solutions.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing this comment to express opposition for Kirkland's Land Use Element 2.4 for the following reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Vague Framework: The new framework for transit corridors is vague and does not address fundamental issues, leading to potential misinterpretations and implementation challenges.</li> <li>2. Impact on Residential Areas: Changing "Residential" land use designations to "Residential Mixed Use" could introduce commercial activities into residential neighborhoods, disrupting the community's character and potentially reducing the quality of life for residents.</li> <li>3. Lack of Specific Guidelines: The plan does not specify what features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones, leading to uncertainty and potential conflicts.</li> <li>4. Questionable Affordability: Increased density is unlikely to result in affordable housing due to high land and construction costs in Kirkland. This could lead to more expensive developments rather than affordable options.</li> <li>5. Public Opposition: There has been significant public opposition, in the council meetings and public hearings, to the transit corridors, with many residents expressing concerns about traffic, safety, and the overall impact on their neighborhoods.</li> </ol>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to express opposition to the Land Use Element 2.4.</p> <p>I have concerns that this proposal is assumes continued public transportation to be available in Kirkland and plans to change the landscape of the suburban neighborhoods of Kirkland. When the city has no control over the public transportation that operates in the area.</p> <p>I would also argue that increased density will not lead to affordable housing due to high land and construction costs in Kirkland.</p> <p>Furthermore, from the public hearings and the community meetings it is obvious this proposal does not have any public support from the Kirkland residents and it concerns me that the Mayor and other council members are claiming exactly the opposite. This seems like an obvious attempt to misinform the public and undermine the concerns expressed by us residents.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p> <p>I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>It is very naive to think that the increase density is going to result in affordable housing. We all know that the any new construction in the city of Kirkland is not going to be affordable simply because the cost to acquire land is so high and add the construction cost to that.</p> <p>I have closely followed the comments at the council meetings and public hearing. I have not heard a single resident come out in favor of the transit corridor. I am shocked that the Mayor is misleading the residents, who may not be following proceedings as closely as a few of us and stating that there has been support for the Transit corridor plans. This is a straightforward tactic to disinform the public and undermine our legitimate concerns.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a 20 year resident of Kirkland and a homeowner, who has raised a family in the wonderful neighborhood of Houghton. Your plan to turn Kirkland into an urban ultra dense transit center that is malignant to families, hostile to children, and fiscally disastrous must not happen. The tendency of most leaders is to do something out of the ordinary to create a legacy, when sometimes the best course of action is to reinforce what makes a city successful. Your legacy should not be as someone who ruined Kirkland. As a business leader I've learned that good growth is more important than numerical growth. More focus on strengthening our neighborhoods and their unique identities is a better plan. Get back to work making our communities stronger. I fear our council and planning commission are listening to outside interests from Seattle activists ( Un"Livable Kirkland") who don't live here, and obvious conflicts of interest from developers. I have listened to council meetings and special sessions which are obviously stacked with activists from outside our community which is wrong as well. As Seattle is waking up to the fact that voting matters and doing something about it, Kirkland too is awakening. Don't do this and get back to listening to your communities and community leaders. That is who matter here.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I was particularly disheartened by tonight's City Council meeting. Why? Because it confirmed for me something I - and I believe others - have suspected but I had hoped was not true. Tonight, we heard from a number of community members expressing specific and nuanced concerns about the plans City staff, Planning Commission, and City Council are making and pursuing through the Draft 2044 Comprehensive Plan. Not a single person stood up and said they were against growth generally or wanted there to be no growth at all in Kirkland. You heard concerns about the amount of growth being proposed and pursued, about how and where Kirkland can and should grow, about whether or not the proposals will actually achieve the desired results and whether that warrants the impacts the proposed changes will have on the community, how to actually achieve housing affordable to those with middle to low incomes, the lack of transparency and true community engagement in the process, and how to make the process better.</p> <p>Yet, Mayor Curtis reinforced the feelings of those community members that their voices are not being heard - perhaps even that Council does not want to hear their voices - when she stated that there had been many speakers who were "no growth." Was that because you were actively not listening to what they had to say once you determined their points did not seem to align with your own views? Was it because you were trying to stifle further comments that while not actually on the same precise topic were nonetheless critical of some aspect of the process and/or proposals? Was it because you don't actually care what Kirkland residents, your constituents, think and have to say? I don't know the answer. I do know that you absolutely did not help those already feeling shut out of this process and like their concerns and their voices don't matter to feel included, represented, or heard. If that was your goal, congratulations, you have succeeded. If that was not your goal, you have a lot of work to do to repair the damage that has been done not just in your comments tonight but as a result of this entire process. Just because you say Kirkland is an inclusive community and all community members are in theory allowed an opportunity to speak does not actually make Kirkland an inclusive community. I encourage you to walk the walk and demonstrate a willingness to actually listen to and truly hear and respect all Kirkland residents' views.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Thank you for hearing our concerns for our beautiful community and thank you for your service to our community.</p> <p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas.</p> <p>Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland for 44 years, I am writing once again to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I want to stress this point. I am NOT opposed to responsibly planned growth. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Loss of Tree Canopy and Backyard Habitat. The proposed density will result in the loss of mature trees and backyard habitat, that web of life including pollinators, mammals, reptiles, and birds. The proposed density will result in deserts devoid of life and with little natural light for both residents of the properties and for plants, insects, and animals. These life forms delight us and are essential to a healthy living planet. If the proposed density is built out, I look forward to an expanse of buildings surrounded by low-maintenance impervious surfaces with a few non-native shrubs and trees struggling to survive with no one to care for and maintain them.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold.</p> <p>This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. Furthermore, citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas. I'd like to see improvements in Metro Bus services to better connect residents to meaningful destinations before major land use decisions are made based on assumptions about ridership.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a proud voting resident of Kirkland, I am writing to express my concerns about the direction the 2044 Comprehensive Plan is taking. While we all understand the importance of planning for future growth, we must ensure that this growth is done responsibly, with adequate infrastructure to support it, and through a transparent process that involves the community at every step. I am against inclusion of the Transit Corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p> <p>1. Responsible Growth: It is unclear how the density levels suggested in this plan will lead to lower housing costs in Kirkland. Many residents, including myself, are concerned about the potential rezoning of single-family neighborhoods along key corridors for residential mixed-use developments. While growth is necessary, it should not come at the expense of the character of our neighborhoods or the livability that makes Kirkland special. I do not support proposals that would allow 50-200 units of housing per acre in residential areas. I am for higher density but against 3 story to 5 story condos in residential neighborhood. Currently we have most of this area to be minimum 8500 sf. We can reduce the requirement size to increase 25 feet max town homes and cottages. Citizens are calling for a shift away from an ideologically driven plan and towards a more practical approach that acknowledges the unique economic conditions in Kirkland. With our high land values, simply increasing density does not create affordable housing under market conditions. The plan needs to reflect these realities if it is to address our community's actual needs.</p> <p>2. Adequate Infrastructure: The density being proposed seems disproportionate to the existing transportation infrastructure across Kirkland. Increased density could strain emergency services and exacerbate overcrowding in schools, which are already facing capacity challenges in some areas.</p> <p>3. Transparent Decision-Making: Transportation and land use decisions are deeply interconnected and should not be made in isolation. The current approach seems fragmented, and the zoning changes proposed could have long-term harmful environmental impacts on Kirkland's natural spaces. As residents, we deserve greater involvement in shaping public transportation solutions and more engagement from the city as these decisions unfold. This letter represents the concerns of myself and many other VOTING residents of Kirkland, who will be watching closely as the City Council moves toward voting on this plan later in the year. As we approach the next election season, we are paying close attention to how the Council listens to and addresses the concerns of its constituents. We urge the Council to adopt a more balanced, economically grounded plan that reflects our city's unique circumstances rather than one rooted in ideology. Thank you for your attention to these matters. I look forward to your response and a more responsible, community-driven approach to Kirkland's future.</p>
9/6/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>IMPACTS-Silicon Valley Kirkland's growth is paralleling the boom that started in Silicon Valley decades earlier. Both areas are experiencing a boom led by high-tech industries that pay very high wages. Some Silicon Valley communities, such as San Jose, could build more housing on open land, but others were already settled and mostly built out, such as Palo Alto (My home for 28 years.). Because it's boom started much earlier, and was also a similar built-out community, Palo Alto today provides a window on Kirkland's future. There are several key lessons that Palo Alto and Silicon Valley provide:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Housing becomes "affordable" only to the new, high income residents, but not to the average existing residents. Over time, the new high income residents will outbid and replace older residents with ordinary incomes.</li> <li>- Price increases will be greatest in the best school districts. High-tech workers will pay anything to get into the best school districts.</li> <li>- Housing, by the traditional definition of price income ratio, will never again be affordable.</li> <li>- Unsubsidized housing construction, of all densities, serves only the high-income market.</li> <li>- Inclusionary zoning for lower income residents is extremely difficult to maintain in the long run.</li> <li>- The only way to provide long-term low-cost housing is public or nonprofit owned and operated housing, which is extremely expensive.</li> <li>- The new high income workers don't use public transportation. After enormous investments, the transit share of commutes is going down in Silicon Valley.</li> <li>- A significant portion of high -income workers are happy to live in high density, luxury condos, particularly when they are young, but the great majority want a single-family home when they start a family.</li> </ul> <p>The Kirkland Planning Staff Response- The current draft land use and housing elements of Kirkland's 2044 comprehensive plan bear no clear relationship to what we already know from actual experience in both Kirkland and Silicon Valley. Neither the housing element nor the land-use element provide any impact analysis or any examples of the results of such policies in other communities. The housing element is a wishlist that provides no guidance on how to achieve its impossible goals, such as 5,900 supervised and serviced units for the homeless. The land-use element takes the other extreme: it proposes a dramatic leap into an unknown future, ending single family zoning and applying a transit corridor overlay that allows upzoning from commercial or single family residential to 4 to 6 story multifamily in roughly 1/3 of the community (3,000 to 4,000 acres). No other community has ever tried upzoning to this degree in such a large portion of the community. When fully implemented this upzoning would allow the construction of at least 90,000 more housing units, (net change of 30 units an acre over 3,000 acres), tripling Kirkland's population. Kirkland would be transformed into something like Seattle's Queen Anne neighborhood if not Manhattan.</p> <p>Upzoning Reality- Upzoning has been tried, on a much smaller scale, in many places. The most comprehensive study of upzoning, and it's impacts, was recently published by the Urban Institute. They found 96 examples of upzoning throughout the country. The result was an average increase of a whole 0.8% in new construction and zero impacts on rent. See <a href="https://journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00420980231159500">https:// journals.sagepub.com/doi/10.1177/00420980231159500</a>. A broader discussion of upzoning appeared in Governing magazine, back in 2019, <a href="https://www.governing.com/archive/gov-zoning-density.html">https://www.governing.com/archive/gov-zoning-density.html</a>. This discussed upzoning impacts ranging from nil in Chicago, to unexpected and unwanted gentrification in Seattle and Philadelphia. The overall results can be summarized as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In high demand locations, upzoning results in the construction of high cost, high rent housing.</li> <li>- Upzoning results in a not always welcome increase in home prices and property taxes. This increase is highest in low income areas which are the most likely</li> </ul>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/5/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm a long time resident..... My husband commutes to his employer in Redmond, while I have worked from home for the past two years. I also serve as the chair of the North Rose Hill Neighborhood Association (NRHNA) board. As an active community volunteer and someone who is very environmentally conscious, I strive to use my e- bike as my primary mode of in-town transportation for about seven months of the year, avoiding it only in the rain and darkness. My husband and I also make an effort to limit our car trips. We are budget-conscious homeowners .....</p> <p>I also make a point of connecting with my neighbors and working to keep the neighborhood clean. We need more community involvement not less. Residents do not want to get involved or spend time in vain when the city refuses to listen to them. Being the chair person I have received many emails from my neighborhood expressing anger and frustration with the new 2044 Comp Plan. Some homeowners in our neighborhood who are not American citizens, many of whom are Asian or Indian, feel hesitant to voice their concerns because they cannot vote. They worry that their opinions might be disregarded or that they might face discrimination due to their non-voting status, and being highly paid tech workers. The city has been heavily focused on addressing the needs of a small group of residents they consider minorities from a specific heritage and low income level, partly due to previous discrimination in our zoning policies. As a city, we need to move forward and ensure that all voices are heard, regardless of background, income level, gender identity, renter/homeowner or voting status. I believe the city needs to pause and reflect on the messages it has been sending to residents. The current communication does not promote a sense of community and has contributed to a divide between those with higher AMI vs those with lower AMI, and their heritage. If you haven't realized it yet in your years on Earth, money and wealth don't buy happiness. What truly matters is finding happiness in where you live and how you engage with your community. The city should put the well-being of its current residents ahead of any political party preferences or personal agendas. Decisions should be guided by what benefits the entire community, rather than being influenced by partisan goals. By focusing on the needs of the people, the city can create an environment where all residents feel valued and supported, regardless of their political affiliations. In summary I believe the city should address the concerns of all current residents, regardless of their heritage, socioeconomic status, gender identity, age, or home ownership status. For this email I am referring to the May 23 meeting packet located at packet for the meeting that contains the updated draft Neighborhood Plans:  <a href="https://kirklandwa.primegov.com/Public/CompiledDocument?meetingTemplateId=1251&amp;compileOutputType=1">https://kirklandwa.primegov.com/Public/CompiledDocument?meetingTemplateId=1251&amp;compileOutputType=1</a></p>
9/5/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We agree with these comments from another commenter: We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed densification plan for the Market Street Corridor..... We chose Kirkland because of the livability and schools and raised two fine sons here. Since that time, we have seen a number of changes, but the proposal to flood this area with high-rise residential buildings is absolutely the worst. ....experience on the Seattle light rail project and before that on similar projects in Portland, experience on those projects and graduate studies at UW show how well cities can benefit from densification, but only if a high-quality transit system is provided in those areas. Trying that out along Market Street is doomed to failure because adding effective transit to accommodate work-to home and home-to-work movement would be impossible. We've heard reference to Kirkland simply following the examples of Bellevue and Redmond. But those Eastside cities have embraced light rail as an essential component of their new urban villages. Our Market Street is already at capacity, and as bus-riders, we can tell you that commuting by bus is a miserable proposition at peak hours. Many times, it is better to get off in downtown Kirkland and walk home rather than sit in a traffic-locked bus. For motorists, it is already frustratingly difficult to turn onto Market from side streets during high-traffic periods. The densification proposal completely ignores the transit element essential for high-density development and affordable housing. We had hoped that the City would look to the Cross-Kirkland Corridor and work out an efficient rail plan with Sound Transit. However, it is apparently more important to let the NIMBYs have their way and waste that resource. The proposed plan is completely hopeless. Please reject this senseless plan and start over adding a transit component to the mix.</p>
9/5/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>In regards to the proposed land use policies mentioned in the Houghton Neighborhood Association comment letter, I cant see the reason why you would want apartments in residential area unless you are moving to socialism and equity and are trying to make us all equal.</p>
9/5/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We do not support the intense densification of Kirkland's residential neighborhoods. We are AGAINST the adoption of the changes to the Comprehensive Plan that permit 4-6 story buildings ¼ mile deep into our neighborhoods along identified "transit corridors". Kirkland's current zoning provides and exceeds our state-mandated growth requirements. Ruining our residential neighborhoods by adding the proposed alarming density changes is unnecessary. The dangerous impacts on parking, streets and utilities will be excessive. We are extremely concerned about the timing to approve and adopt this proposal on December 10th. We will do what we can to inform our neighbors and am sure as they have also invested in Kirkland by living here that they will also be AGAINST the changes to the Comprehensive Plan.</p>
9/5/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to share my opposition to the current Comprehensive Plan being considered by the City Council, particularly the current proposals for high density development in residential neighborhoods. As a long-time resident of Kirkland and a Kirkland voter, I want to make sure that my views are heard. While I am pro-growth and pro-affordable housing, the current plan makes no sense. It is not data-driven and provides no adequate explanation of how infrastructure and traffic will be mitigated if it is adopted. There are also concerns that infrastructure changes may require application of eminent domain but this has not been shared in any public forum. I would like to hear my City Council represent all views and I want to see transparent decision-making. Neighboring suburbs have effectively promoted growth with thoughtful planning. Why can't Kirkland do the same rather than railroading through a plan supported by a vocal minority and businesses that stand to gain financially?                      I will be voting against the re-election of any Council member's who supports this plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm looking forward to the outcome of your discussions about LU-2.4 at the meeting next week. I really appreciate all the time that you and staff have spent taking in and processing community feedback on this issue. It's been disheartening to see that the discussion around LU-2.4 hasn't changed much after staff presented a new version of the policy with more details about process and criteria. There's still a lot of concern that the city hasn't considered all the impacts of increasing density along transit corridors. And they're right - because this policy is what would kick off the study process! So of course it hasn't happened yet. It's clear to me that the city will take local considerations into account during the study, and propose zoning that is appropriate for the local conditions. Transportation capacity will be taken into account as required by state law. On paper, the city currently has enough development capacity to reach its next growth target, true. However, we've already built over 3,000 units towards our goal, and yet the rise in housing costs isn't slowing down. In fact, they're rising faster than pre-covid. We need to ask if our current strategies are really enough to get this under control. And all the while, the land along these corridors is already being redeveloped. Houses are being replaced with ones that cost at least twice as much, and once a property redevelops like that, it's locked in for decades.</p> <p>Pulling LU-2.4 will not keep our neighborhoods the way they are now - our neighborhoods are changing either way. I can't see how the status quo is better for our neighborhoods and families than allowing more housing types. How many families are served by these new \$3M dollar houses?</p> <p>Please move forward with LU-2.4, and don't include language that limits when the study can start. These corridors deserve to be studied. They deserve to go into the prioritization process for the planning department just like anything else. I hear the concerns about if the station area will get fully built out, and by all means, if that's limited by city policy rather than external factors, it should be looked into. But to kill LU-2.4 now is saying that there's no way that we'll want more density in any of these locations anytime in the next 20 years.</p>
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to the Kirkland City Planning Commissioners today to register my concerns regarding the Land Use Proposal LU-2.4. I understand that this zoning proposal would have a significant impact on life as we currently know it in the Houghton area. I am fervently opposed to the zoning changes that would allow an unacceptable increase in our housing density, both in building height allowances and the number of units of housing per acre. The impact of these changes would completely upend the nature of our Houghton neighborhood and why it has been a desirable place to live for many years.</p> <p>From 2015-2019, all of the local neighborhood associations in Kirkland spent a great deal of time and effort to address our neighborhood plans. NONE of these completed plans had any preference for the type of high density zoning that is being proposed by the Kirkland City Planning Commission. I often hear the phrase from our Kirkland City Council and all related bodies that "we want to hear from you". You did in these submitted and approved neighborhood plans, and the intent of those who live in Kirkland has not changed. Families move here to have the kind of life that single family zoning provides; this adds value to our homes and to our city's reputation. I ask you not to destroy that. You HAVE heard from us, and those you are appointed to serve do not want high density mixed use housing.</p> <p>There are proposed changes to our transportation system that I do not agree with. In order to accommodate the proposed high density housing in the LU-2.4 proposal, 108th Avenue would be changed to accommodate Rapid Ride buses with service every 7 minutes. Why Rapid Ride on 108th? This is the heart of Houghton, where we walk and where our children (and adults) ride bikes in the bike lanes; generating added bus service on the same surface area would be untenable and create a hazardous environment. We have multiple schools that front onto 108th in addition to ICS/Community school on 110th; the safety of the children coming to these schools is already challenging. The LWSD Emerson/BEST School will be remodeled or replaced and the student population will be increased in 2027-28. The addition of higher density housing and the increased traffic generated by more people will only make this a less safe neighborhood.</p> <p>We appreciate the time and effort the Kirkland City Planning Commission has spent in looking into the future for Kirkland. As one who has lived in Houghton since 1985 (and paid a great deal of tax dollars into this community) I strongly disagree with the proposed changes outlined in the LU-2.4 proposal. I hope that you will hear the many other voices that are in disagreement with what is being proposed.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As I look around Kirkland I see many, many housing projects being built, from single family homes to 10-25 unit condos and apartments to huge multi-hundred apartment units being built. I have yet to see anything that I would call “affordable” for the average working person.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Two new average size homes facing very busy State St. are now on the market for \$3.45 million - not what I'd call affordable.</li> <li>•About 12 units, apparently “affordable” condos, are nearing completion on the SW corner of 6th St. S. and Kirkland Way. The “alley” between the 2 buildings is so narrow that only those driving a tiny car will be able to use the garage, but since the units are “affordable,” buyers may not even own a car. Weird project on what used to be a single-family lot.</li> <li>•Twenty-two new condos are near completion behind St. John’s church on State St. They are each 1- room wide and 4 stories tall - with no elevator. At the price they will sell, not only are they not affordable but they will only appeal to high-earning families in excellent physical condition. It’s a crazy plan, but they’ll probably sell - to the benefit of the developers more than making Kirkland more livable.</li> <li>•There are large apartment projects recently built or still under construction that have anywhere from 50-500 units. Bloom, Vela and the huge project on Slater in Totem Lake come to mind. Rents are way out of the range of those working at Starbucks or at any of our other service jobs.</li> <li>•Expecting transit to be the answer to traffic is laudable but has no basis when Metro and Sound Transit have no plans to improve service. And what service they do provide now is not being used. Buses leaving the Transit Center near the library are rarely carrying more than 5 people. Maybe they fill up at the South Kirkland Park &amp; Ride, but that’s as much Bellevue as Kirkland.</li> <li>•Traffic is already horrendous during rush hour (now about 4 hours a day). Increased density will not solve that.</li> <li>•And again, I seem to be the only one pointing a finger at a major choke point that will always remain: Central Way and Lake Street, one-lane in each direction at a T-intersection resulting in backups a mile long at times. Greater density anywhere within 1/2 mile of that intersection will make that so much worse.</li> </ul> <p>What you, the Planning Commission, are doing is pie-in-the-sky planning. Density is not going to lower prices but it will worsen livability or reduce homelessness, which BTW is a tiny, tiny problem in Kirkland that cannot be remedied on a local level. We’re rapidly turning into a suburban version of Seattle. You’re the specialists so I hope you can find better ways to solve problems.</p>
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have been a resident of Kirkland for fourteen years, moving to the Houghton neighborhood from Bellevue to embrace a safe, quiet and connected residential community that reflected our values. Before my husband and I decided to buy our home, I paid a visit to Kirkland City Hall to verify the reliability of the height restrictions for homes in the area. I was assured that the codes had been in place for years and were enforced to protect homeowners from losing their views and property values. In the wake of that meeting, we went ahead and bought our home, trusting the city to uphold it’s word. We worked hard for many years and saved our money so that one day we could afford a home in a residential community like Houghton. We paid our taxes, did home improvements as was necessary and believed we were investing in our future. Imagine our surprise to find out from CherishKirkland.org that the current City Council members have quietly been planning to change those height restrictions to allow 4-6 story multi-family structures to be built in our neighborhood! We feel like the rug has been pulled out from under us and have lost our trust in the City Council’s decision-making process. When we moved here there was some traffic on 108th but, over the years, with more residents there is now more traffic. However, the Council’s idea of widening 108th NE and adding more buses to accommodate more people is not going to solve the traffic problem. I walk the neighborhood every day, at all different times of the day, and I see that most of the buses are either empty or have just a handful of riders. Most people want to be independent and have flexibility. Commuting from where we live to where we work has always been necessary for most people unless our jobs allow us to work from home, now more common since the Pandemic. It is my opinion that building more apartments in urban areas of Kirkland, rather than in established residential neighborhoods, makes much more sense with the option of then adding more buses and bus routes in those areas as needed.</p> <p>In summary, I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I request that the Council remove all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Houghton Neighborhood Association Board of Directors:            As an active member of the Kirkland community and the Houghton Neighborhood Association (HNA), I ask that you REJECT the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering.            The transportation oriented development land use proposal should be REMOVED completely from the Comprehensive Plan.            I implore you to vote in accordance with the will of the majority of taxpayers of Kirkland.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• We do not see how the density suggested in this plan will reduce the cost of housing in Houghton.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want the potential for single family homes along 108th/Houghton Boulevard and ¼ mile east / west to be rezoned for residential mixed-use.</li> <li>• Our neighbors do not want 50-200 units of housing per acre.</li> <li>• We don't believe the density proposed in this plan is proportional to the transportation infrastructure.</li> <li>• We believe that emergency services will be hindered and schools overcrowded. We already face problems with overcrowding at Lakeview.</li> <li>• We would like to see Metro Bus Service on 108th connect to meaningful destinations for our neighbors to increase ridership before considering land use decisions related to ridership</li> <li>• We believe transportation and land use decisions are tightly related and should not be considered or decided with a flawed, siloed approach like this.</li> <li>• We believe this type of policy and subsequent zoning will be harmful to the environment</li> <li>• HNA would like to be engaged and involved by the City in public transportation solutions for our neighborhood</li> </ul>
9/4/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed</p>
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The Comprehensive Plan, as it stands, poses several issues that could negatively impact the quality of life in our community. Here are the primary concerns that motivate my opposition:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Loss of Community Character: My wife and I moved to Kirkland from Seattle last year specifically to escape high-density development and enjoy a community with front yards and safe, quiet streets. The plan's focus on increasing density threatens to erode the very qualities that attracted us to Kirkland. The proposed zoning changes and higher building heights could drastically alter our neighborhood's character, which we value greatly.</li> <li>2.Increased Traffic and Congestion: The plan's emphasis on density and development is likely to exacerbate traffic congestion and strain our infrastructure. Traffic on 70th Avenue is already congested and unsafe. We cross at the 124th Street crosswalk daily when walking our dog and have been nearly hit on several occasions. We have also noticed that, even with the current population, public buses are rarely used, and many people rely on personal vehicles. How can the city guarantee that increased density will not lead to more traffic congestion from personal cars if public transit options are not significantly improved and more widely utilized? The plan should address how it will effectively manage the anticipated traffic increases and ensure that public transit options are truly viable alternatives.</li> <li>3.Environmental Impact: The proposed developments may have significant environmental consequences. Increased construction and density could negatively impact local ecosystems, green spaces, and wildlife habitats. Protecting our natural environment should be a top priority, and the plan seems to fall short in this regard.</li> <li>4.Lack of Adequate Public Services: One of the reasons my wife and I chose to move to Kirkland was the high quality of the local school system. The plan does not adequately address how the school system will be expanded to accommodate the anticipated population growth while preserving the quality of education. How will the city ensure that schools do not become overcrowded, that class sizes do not increase, and that the high standards of education are maintained?</li> <li>5.Community Input and Transparency: There has been a lack of sufficient community engagement and transparency throughout the development of this plan. Many residents feel that their concerns and preferences have not been adequately considered or addressed.</li> </ol> <p>In light of these concerns, I also urge that this matter be put to a city-wide vote. If decisions like building a community rec center are deemed significant enough to be on the ballot, then surely a plan that changes the character, traffic, and soul of our city should be subjected to the same level of public scrutiny and approval.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Kirkland has NO credible plan for the changes that are contemplated in the 2024 Comprehensive Plan relative to the Transit Corridors. Adding the land use plan changes without Kirkland Citizen input formally considered is both irresponsible and dangerous.</p> <p>The in-place plan has zoning that enables Kirkland to meet the 2044 housing requirements.</p> <p>Adding affordable housing at the volumes enabled by the proposed land use plan changes will result in 24x7 gridlock on the main thoroughfares and parking wars and dangerously constricted side streets. This will result in a significant reduction in the quality of life for all Kirkland residents.</p> <p>Kirkland resident Richard Carlson details these issues clearly in his public comments....</p> <p>One key point in Mr. Carson's note is: No other community in the nation has ever tried such a massive rezoning.</p> <p>Why should Kirkland to be first with this "social experiment", especially when it's highly likely to not meet its goals and ultimately fail?</p> <p>It strikes me as extremely irresponsible for the City Council to move forward in any way with the Comprehensive Plan as currently written. There are a HUGE drawbacks, with the only positive being the possibility of additional affordable housing being built. But that positive is risky and most definitely not assured by these changes.</p> <p>I hope the Kirkland City Council is not planning to leave the Transit Corridors and resulting land use plan changes in the Comprehensive plan without having proper input from taxpaying Kirkland Residents broadly formally considered. Doing so would be a highly imprudent step by the Council</p>
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My wife (on CC here) and I are long-term residents of Kirkland, we own and live in family our house on 11th Ave. We are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, we ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.</p>
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to express my strong support for the inclusion of more housing in the upcoming update to Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan. As our community continues to grow, it is crucial that we take proactive steps to ensure that housing availability keeps pace with demand. The decisions made in this plan will shape the future of our city, and it is imperative that we prioritize the development of diverse housing options to meet the needs of all residents. The current housing shortage is a pressing issue that affects not only affordability but also the overall quality of life in our city. Without sufficient housing, we risk driving out longtime residents and making Kirkland inaccessible to young families, essential workers, and others who contribute to the vibrancy of our community. Increasing housing density, particularly in areas with access to public transportation and other amenities, will help to alleviate these pressures.</p> <p>Moreover, adding more housing aligns with Kirkland's broader goals of sustainability and economic vitality. Higher-density development can reduce our carbon footprint by minimizing the need for long commutes, while also supporting local businesses and services by increasing the customer base. Thoughtful planning that incorporates mixed-use developments and affordable housing options will ensure that Kirkland remains an inclusive and thriving place for all who live and work here.</p> <p>I urge the Planning Commission to adopt policies that encourage the development of more housing, particularly affordable and workforce housing, in the Comprehensive Plan. This is not just about meeting current demand but about planning for a future that is equitable, sustainable, and vibrant</p>
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a resident of Kirkland and have been recently following the discussion regarding the 2040 plan involving up-zoning along transportation corridors. I do not feel that this change is being made with the interests of Kirkland's current and future residents. I understand that we could make strides to improve our density but there are already changes to the law that we have not yet seen the impact of that should allow us to get to the level of density that we owe the county. I'm opposed to this change for many reasons but predominantly for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.This process has not been transparent and it has been poorly publicized. Only recently did members of the community figure out that these decisions were being proposed and still, there is very low awareness of the changes being proposed. Not one Kirkland resident that I've spoken to, is in favor of this proposal and most have no idea that it is even being discussed. This lack of transparency seems to be HIGHLY DECEPTIVE or SUSPICIOUS at best. Changes of this magnitude require more community outreach.</li> <li>2.The size and scope of the proposal is huge both in terms of the number of units per acre, the possible height of the buildings AND with the 1/4 mile swath of land being considered adjacent to the corridors. The impact of zoning so poorly conceived ends up being dark, windy streets, where views are negatively impacted, light is diminished, neighborhoods are bisected and the sense of community is lost.</li> <li>3.The new buildings will cut off neighborhoods and reduce residential zoning in a town that is already struggling with infrastructure and traffic. Without the vote of the people, you are drastically changing the nature of our community.</li> <li>4.We have existing commercial zoning that can be utilized to help us meet our growth management act requirements and those commercial zones are TRANSPARENTLY COMMERCIAL. Larger buildings there are NO SURPRISE to adjacent residents and don't reduce existing residential zoning. These can and must be maximized, before we even consider further changes.</li> <li>5.We are already impacted by the new zoning regulations adopted in Kirkland that allow for ADUs, DADUs, Cottage Housing etc. Have we evaluated how that is going and how it's impacting our goals? Seems that it is reasonable to evaluate that before expanding further.</li> <li>6.The state legislature has mandated zoning changes for cities above 25,000 residents. This has not gone into effect yet and again, it seems very reasonable to evaluate that new legislation and the impact on density and population before adding greater expansion of density.</li> <li>7.We are already dense relative to most cities in King, Snohomish and Pierce counties and we are on track to more than meet our growth management act requirements. We need you to smartly grow, NOT provide every developer the opportunity to spoil our town.</li> </ol> <p>My voting is and has always been progressive and I've supported every school levy, parks proposal and public safety legislation that has ever been put on the ballot locally and at the state level, however the overreach of these planning commission changes are outrageous, deceptive and don't represent the wishes of actual Kirkland residents.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to NOT ADOPT THE PROPOSAL, not adopt any "framework" that allows for consideration of changes of the proposed magnitude and to completely table the discussion for future evaluation.</p>
9/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I write to you to urge you NOT to adopt proposed changes to the 2044 comprehensive plan regarding high-density zoning and transit corridors. I have lived in Kirkland for over 25 years, from the time I was 4 years old. I have patronized every common space and public service, learned at local schools, played on local sports teams, worked at downtown Kirkland businesses, and taken public transit all over the Eastside and across the lake to Seattle. I am proud of the city that raised me, and would not like to see it harmed by out-of-touch measures to increase growth at any cost. My primary issues with the proposal are as follows:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. There has been insufficient opportunity for public comment and feedback. Respectfully, this change has been under-publicized. As soon as community members got wind of the proposal to study a change to the plan, there was a swift and forceful backlash. The August planning commission meeting was packed with people opposed to the change. Many of them, including my father, were not able to voice their concerns due to the crowd size. When it comes to municipal notice and comment rule making, minimal notice to solicit comments may be technically sufficient, but it is also dishonest and belies the unpopularity of the proposal in question.</li> <li>2. Kirkland is already ahead of all metrics with regard to its growth goals. Kirkland is already projected to have a surplus capacity of over 6,000 housing units above state targets by 2044. This is not a "more is better" situation. Increasing density must be balanced against the benefits of living with safe streets and green spaces.</li> <li>3. This change will diminish the character of what makes Kirkland a desirable place to live. We have already lost much of that character with the Park Place overhaul. Allowing 7 story buildings and up to 200 or 250 units per acre on each site within 1/4 mile of designated transportation corridors, particularly in the highlands, will transform a lush patchwork of suburban homes into a Crossroads-like maze of dark and congested streets.</li> <li>4. We have existing commercial zoning that can be utilized to help us meet our growth management act requirements and those commercial zones are TRANSPARENTLY COMMERCIAL. Larger buildings there are NO SURPRISE to adjacent residents and don't reduce existing residential zoning. These can and must be maximized, before we even consider further changes.</li> <li>5. The size and scope of the proposal is huge both in terms of the number of units per acre, the possible height of the buildings AND with the 1/4 mile swath of land being considered adjacent to the corridors. The impact of zoning so poorly conceived ends up being dark, windy streets, where views are negatively impacted, light is diminished, neighborhoods are bisected and the sense of community is lost.</li> </ol> <p>I urge you to not adopt this proposal or otherwise pursue this type of change to the Comprehensive Plan. Please serve the people who live here now instead of those hypothetical masses who might want to some day, and who are already provided for by current measures.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/2/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. Our current plan is working. We have new apartments going up in Totem Lake and new ones soon to be built on 85th. Today on Zillow there are 632 rentals available in Kirkland. 282 of these are less than \$2,500 per month. We already have affordable housing in Kirkland. We are not Bellevue, Redmond, Seattle or San Francisco. We are Kirkland. Please keep us Kirkland.
9/2/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed
9/2/2024	Land Use Changes	We are 34+ years residents of Kirkland. We are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. We ask for all LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.
9/2/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a Kirkland resident. I do NOT approve of the transit corridors in this plan. therefore, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items be removed.
9/2/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Land Use Transit Corridors- I'm opposed to this change for many reasons but predominantly for the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. This process has not been transparent and it has been poorly publicized. Only recently did members of the community figure out that these decisions were being proposed and still, there is very low awareness of the changes being proposed. Not one Kirkland resident that I've spoken to, is in favor of this proposal and most have no idea that it is even being discussed. This lack of transparency seems to be HIGHLY DECEPTIVE or SUSPICIOUS at best. Changes of this magnitude require more community outreach.</li> <li>2. The size and scope of the proposal is huge both in terms of the number of units per acre, the possible height of the buildings AND with the 1/4 mile swath of land being considered adjacent to the corridors. The impact of zoning so poorly conceived ends up being dark, windy streets, where views are negatively impacted, light is diminished, neighborhoods are bisected and the sense of community is lost.</li> <li>3. The new buildings will cut off neighborhoods and reduce residential zoning in a town that is already struggling with infrastructure and traffic. Without the vote of the people, you are drastically changing the nature of our community.</li> <li>4. We have existing commercial zoning that can be utilized to help us meet our growth management act requirements and those commercial zones are TRANSPARENTLY COMMERCIAL. Larger buildings there are NO SURPRISE to adjacent residents and don't reduce existing residential zoning. These can and must be maximized, before we even consider further changes.</li> <li>5. We are already impacted by the new zoning regulations adopted in Kirkland that allow for ADUs, DADUs, Cottage Housing etc. Have we evaluated how that is going and how it's impacting our goals? Seems that it is reasonable to evaluate that before expanding further.</li> <li>6. The state legislature has mandated zoning changes for cities above 25,000 residents. This has not gone into effect yet and again, it seems very reasonable to evaluate that new legislation and the impact on density and population before adding greater expansion of density.</li> <li>7. We are already dense relative to most cities in King, Snohomish and Pierce counties and we are on track to more than meet our growth management act requirements. We need you to smartly grow, NOT provide every developer the opportunity to spoil our town.</li> </ol> <p>My voting is and has always been progressive and I've supported every school levy, parks proposal and public safety legislation that has ever been put on the ballot locally and at the state level, however the overreach of these planning commission changes are outrageous, deceptive and don't represent the wishes of actual Kirkland residents.</p> <p>I strongly encourage you to NOT ADOPT THE PROPOSAL, not adopt any "framework" that allows for consideration of changes of the proposed magnitude and to completely table the discussion for future evaluation.</p>
9/1/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a 62-year resident of Kirkland born and raised. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed
9/1/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a 44-year resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed
9/1/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a long-time resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed from the Plan.</p> <p>Such development, as allowed by the Policy, would result in destruction of residential Kirkland as we know it. I believe such development, if required by the density mandates of the County or State, would best be served along our true transit corridor, Interstate 405. I do not believe that the City has been forthcoming in sharing information on those density requirements with us citizens, including information on whether we have met those requirements or what further efforts are needed to meet such requirements. There are alternatives that should be addressed.</p> <p>Development along residential streets that allows such densities as envisioned, would require modifications to sewer and water infrastructure. Increased traffic loads will result in residential streets being turned into four-lane arterials. Not enough people will turn to riding the bus, to make a difference in increased traffic loads. These changes in infrastructure, and their impact on the neighborhoods and the environment, should be addressed before any Policy is included in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/31/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I say YES to more access to housing in Kirkland!                      I'm a project mgmt professional living, working, and voting in Kirkland... and 50% of my monthly income goes towards living in a one bedroom apartment in Kirkland.</p> <p>I choose to take this financial hit because I want to live in a place that has a vibrant, walkable downtown, access to transit, has parks and walking trails, and has access to the lake... a "10-minute neighborhood."</p> <p>I have read through the May 2024 version of the draft Comprehensive Plan (land use element) and agree with the proposals that plan for increasing housing to meet the needs throughout the future. It is a forward-thinking policy to promote housing equity.</p> <p>I'd like to highlight the two main things that are important to me and that I want to make sure are included in Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Land use policies that support an increase in affordable "middle" housing</li> <li>2. Land use policies that value community space</li> </ol> <p>Please keep the specificity in the plan around the following:                      (Suggestions for Policy LU-1.3, LU-2.4, and LU-5.1)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Community garden space (access to growing food) - add to 1.3? - important to include specific language to allow (and promote) this land use in residential areas</li> <li>•Diverse public art requirements (art as part of architecture, murals)</li> <li>•Streetscaping and landscaping requirements with trees, native plants, rain gardens, Bioswales, etc</li> </ul>
8/28/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We were not able to attend the recent public meeting at City Hall, but this letter will express our thoughts about the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. We know that it is not an easy task, and we can only hope that we are sincerely being heard with open hearts.</p> <p>My husband and I have been residents of Kirkland for 39 years, and we raised our boys here. We still have a yard with almost two plats, and we make full use of it by building community through monthly Music Nights, which are campfires in the summer when possible. We have met many incredibly lovely souls by doing this—I post announcements on Nextdoor, and, in fact, KIRO 7 interviewed me two years ago about these gatherings, and people responded because they love Kirkland and wanted to connect with their neighbors. We ALL love the ambiance here.</p> <p>We have watched our neighborhood change from "Old Kirkland" to Norkirk, and because of the space we've been blessed with it still feels a bit countryish. These days we hear a lot of building happening around us, which is expected when old houses are torn down.</p> <p>However...we also see and feel the squeezing in of several smaller houses on some lots on our own block, and it feels like packing crates being built. I cringe when I see the long, low facilities advertising "Self Storage" sprinkled around King County because I picture people being inserted upright on forklifts into storage lockers. It actually feels like this is what Kirkland will be like with the transit corridors. I know that sounds extreme, but you have to be living it to understand.</p> <p>We are in complete agreement with the following comments and requests from the "Cherish Kirkland" group we recently joined:</p> <p>"We request that all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items be removed. City Staff have included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element which is still vague, and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. In addition, the plan update eliminates 'Residential' land-use designations. Changing all these areas to 'Residential Mixed-Use' is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones."</p> <p>"We strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The City should stay focused on existing plans already in effect like the 85th Street Station Area Plan, missing middle zoning, and existing commercial centers, as well as existing policies, goals, and commitment to building the infrastructure and services to make existing plans a reality.</li> <li>2) Transit service hours continue to decline across the City, along with ridership. The reliability of the bus system is strained, given the poor transportation connectivity across our city. To suddenly say there is capacity to build more housing simply because there is an existing bus line is hard to understand from a practical point of view. (sic)</li> <li>3) Kirkland will exceed its growth targets without transit corridors."</li> </ol> <p>My husband and I, along with Cherish Kirkland and many other friends and neighbors who live here, strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/28/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>OVERKILL Kirkland's housing affordability problem is evidence of success, not failure. To its natural economic advantage of being located near three of the hottest labor markets on earth, Redmond, Bellevue and Lake Union, Kirkland added good schools, great parks and lovely neighborhoods providing attractive lifestyles ranging from semi-rural to urban. As local employment of high-income tech workers boomed over the last decade, no power on earth could have prevented those high-income workers from bidding up the price of Kirkland's attractive housing. Microsoft alone doubled its employment and wages over the last decade, and many of those "softies", in their tens of thousands, wanted to live in Kirkland. The fundamental problem facing Kirkland is how to ameliorate the resulting problem of unaffordable housing without destroying the lovely environment that helped create the problem. I spent nearly 30 years, 1976-2003, dealing with exactly the same problem in Palo Alto, California, where I worked and lived. The only difference is that Palo Alto home prices exploded 20 years before the same thing happened in Kirkland. Policymakers in both communities must face the same fundamental reality: 1. Neither community will ever be "affordable" again, at least not in the lifetimes of anyone reading this document. The housing problem can be improved, but not solved. 2. All new construction will serve the high-income market. It is impossible to actually build new affordable housing without huge subsidies; costs of land and labor are too high. 3. Transportation is the ultimate limit to home construction. Overbuilding could easily lead to gridlock. 4. The lifestyles of the new high-income residents will require flexible, personal transportation: cars. Their time is far too valuable to wait for or fit with a bus schedule. 5. The scarcest resource is family housing, and that demand is and will be mostly for single family homes. Given these constraints, the reasonable approach would be to rezone older commercial and residential areas adjacent to workplaces and transportation hubs. Kirkland has already done this. Multi-family construction has boomed both in downtown and Totem Lake. Enough rezoning is already in place to substantially increase housing supply by 15 to 20,000 units. That is more than enough supply to both meet state standards and sharply slow the rise in rents. It also means a huge population increase; 20,000 more units means about 50,000 more people and 30,000 more cars, a 50% increase. The transportation problems created by this rezoning, alone, may well be more than the existing system can handle. Gridlock is already occurring, and will clearly get worse. Instead of building on this base and facing the coming transportation problems, the Kirkland Planning Commission staff is proposing to leapfrog to the largest land use changes ever attempted by a settled American community. The proposed land use plan allows rezoning of an enormous area, 1 mile across and 9 miles long. That is 9 square miles or over 6,000 acres. It allows rezoning from single family residential to 4-6 story multifamily 1/4 mile one each side of the two main north south corridors that extend the whole length of the city. This allows rezoning of all of Kirkland south of Central street and much of it to the north. Upzoning from current levels, less than 10 units an acre, to the new levels, over 40 units an acre is an increase of over 30 units per acre. Discounting for parks, current zoning and other geographic limits, we're still talking about 100,000 potential net new units, or a new population of about 250,000, a total of 3.5 times the current population. The staff contends that the land use plan does not change the zoning, it "only allows" re-zoning. That is nonsense. Once the city allows such re-zoning, a wave of rezoning requests will overwhelm the community. If the city refuses, a wave of lawsuits will follow. Rezoning at this level in this community is worth a million dollars an acre, which will pay for a lot of lawyers. Developers are already financing a group of well organized high-density proponents that is first in line at every hearing. Once the land use plan is approved, the developer has the legal upper hand. The city will have to prove that the specific rezoning proposal, which will now be consistent with the General Plan, should not be approved. No other community in the nation has ever tried such a massive rezoning. Neither the school system nor the transportation network could handle anything approaching these numbers. The proposal essentially allows 4 to 6 story</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/28/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The Comprehensive Plan is OVERKILL – states Dr. Richard Carlson Owner of Spectrum Economics, Former Economist at SRI International, and concerned Kirkland resident. Here is an excerpt of his analysis: Kirkland’s housing affordability problem is evidence of success, not failure. To its natural economic advantage of being located near three of the hottest labor markets on earth, Redmond, Bellevue and Lake Union, Kirkland added good schools, great parks and lovely neighborhoods providing attractive lifestyles ranging from semi-rural to urban. As local employment of high-income tech workers boomed over the last decade, no power on earth could have prevented those high-income workers from bidding up the price of Kirkland’s attractive housing. Microsoft alone has doubled its employment and wages over the last decade, and many of those “softies”, in tens of thousands, wanted to live in Kirkland. The fundamental problem facing Kirkland is how to ameliorate the resulting problem of unaffordable housing without destroying the lovely environment that helped create the problem. I spent nearly 30 years, 1976-2003, dealing with exactly the same problem in Palo Alto, California, where I worked and lived. The only difference is that Palo Alto home prices exploded 20 years before the same thing happened in Kirkland.</p> <p>Policymakers in both communities must face the same fundamental reality:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Neither community will ever be “affordable” again, at least not in the lifetimes of anyone reading this document. The housing problem can be improved, but not solved.</li> <li>2. All new construction will serve the high-income market. It is impossible to actually build new affordable housing without huge subsidies; costs of land and labor are too high.</li> <li>3. Transportation is the ultimate limit to home construction. Overbuilding could easily lead to gridlock.</li> <li>4. The lifestyles of the new high-income residents will require flexible, personal transportation: cars. Their time is far too valuable to wait for or fit with a bus schedule.</li> <li>5. The scarcest resource is family housing, and that demand is and will be mostly for single-family homes. Given these constraints, the reasonable approach would be to rezone older commercial and residential areas adjacent to workplaces and transportation hubs. Kirkland has already done this. Multi-family construction has boomed both in downtown and Totem Lake. Enough rezoning is already in place to substantially increase the housing supply by 15 to 20,000 units. That is more than enough supply to both meet state standards and sharply slow the rise in rents. It also means a huge population increase; 20,000 more units means about 50,000 more people and 30,000 more cars, a 50% increase. The transportation problems created by this rezoning, alone, may well be more than the existing system can handle. Gridlock is already occurring, and will get worse. Instead of building on this base and facing the coming transportation problems, the Kirkland Planning Commission staff is proposing to leapfrog to the largest land use changes ever attempted by a settled American community. The proposed land use plan allows the rezoning of an enormous area, 1 mile across and 9 miles long. That is 9 square miles or over 6,000 acres. It allows rezoning from single-family residential to 4-6 story multi-family 1/4 mile on each side of the two main north-south corridors that extend the whole length of the city. This allows rezoning of all of Kirkland south of Central Street and much of it to the north. Upzoning from current levels, less than 10 units an acre, to the new levels, over 40 units an acre is an increase of over 30 units per acre. Discounting for parks, current zoning and other geographic limits, we’re still talking about 100,000 potential net new units, or a new population of about 250,000, a total of 3.5 times the current population</li> </ol>
8/27/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I saw some yard signs protesting rezoning single family home areas near transportation corridors and I wanted to submit a comment hugely in SUPPORT of zoning changes that create more density. Not only are these good for the economy of the regions they are moving into - building more housing is the only thing that is proven to actually drive down housing prices which are higher than ever. This has been shown true with many recent examples like in Minnesota and Chicago where increases in housing availability (density) have dramatically reduced prices. This is good for everyone! And who doesn't want to be able to walk to a cafe near where they live? Walkability for the win! I'm a resident of the Rose Hill neighborhood and would be directly in the zone of these changes, and I'm a huge fan of them!</p>
8/26/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We are writing to urge the City Council not to pass changes to the Comprehensive Plan to allow the intense densification that would permit 4-6 story building along identified transit corridors. Kirkland's roads, and these corridors in particular, are frequently congested. Geography and topography limit or render not viable improvements to carry more traffic. Parking, many of these areas is already dysfunctional. The character of many neighborhoods in the area has changed already as increasing numbers of drivers seek routes to bypass some of these corridors. Pedestrian safety is frequently at risk. The changes under consideration will worsen an already appalling traffic situation that continues to affect many Kirkland residents and commuters daily. Moreover, the ostensible results of these changes are supernumerary to meeting Comprehensive Plan goals which, you must know, are well on track. Abandon this ill-considered idea. Consider that, if implemented, the impacts will degrade the quality of life of current residents. Consider that introducing higher density housing and more businesses to these areas is of questionable benefit to residents, the people you represent. Things do not always get better through an inexorable process of growth. We acknowledge the benefit to developers</p>
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am sharing this email in complete support of the email below from the HNA. We are Central Houghton residents and believe this plan will make congestion worse without actually lowering the cost of housing. I would implore our elected officials to listen to our concerns.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>1. I am concerned that this plan update eliminates “Residential” land use designations. Changing all these areas to “Residential Mixed Use” is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>2. Having these residential corridors without first scaling up the infrastructure (like transit, schools etc) is going to heavily overload the existing infrastructure. The single lane streets that connect Kirkland to the freeways will be overcrowded and cause traffic jams. The schools and parks will not be able to scale. The overall livability of the neighborhood will see a downfall.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Six days a week at exactly 7 AM I am serenaded by BZZZZZ! BANG BANG BANG. Beep beep beep. That is the sound of new houses being built. In the Market Neighborhood. In just the 3 blocks around my house, builders have added at least 12 new housing units over the past year.</p> <p>That’s NET NEW UNITS. Not replacing one house with another. That’s replacing a bungalow with 3 units. Replacing a modest ranch house with 4 houses. And so on. The zoning changes that Kirkland made in 2020 are working. They encourage “middle housing” -- like ADUs, duplexes, and cottage homes. Kirkland’s current zoning enables the addition of 13,200 additional housing units by 2044, which is roughly a 35% increase in population. My neighborhood appears to be ahead of the goal. The city’s forecast for new houses is 4.7 per year for the entire Market neighborhood, and my little corner has added 12 in one year with high interest rates and high land costs. This density increase is causing issues like streets blocked by parked cars and loss of green space, which we can discuss another time, but housing is increasing. Kirkland’s Land Use plan must leverage the efforts we have spent so much time to develop – encourage the walkable neighborhoods in our urban centers, revitalize our neighborhood commercial centers, and achieve infill with middle housing. Remove the transit corridors from the Land Use plan. They are an undeveloped idea that is the wrong approach for Kirkland.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I live in the Bridle Trails neighborhood with my husband and five kids, ages 4-16, and we do most of our transportation by bike. I love living in Kirkland. I love Bridle Trails Park and the Lake Washington Saddle Club. I love my church, Holy Family. I love Studio East. I especially love that I and my kids can bike to all of these places. This would not be the case if we didn't live in Kirkland, which we are fortunate to do because of a good tech job and good market timing. I support more housing in all places around Kirkland, but especially in frequent transit corridors. I would like my friends to not need to move. I would like my kids to be able to live here when they grow up. I would like my kids teachers not to need to commute for an hour - it's hard enough to be a teacher these days. In a city, apartments and single family houses coexist on the same street. People who can't afford the 1.5 million for a house also deserve to live on a street that is quiet and not polluted. Not every apartment needs to be on a major arterial. I also support less parking because less parking means less driving. Kirkland is a great place to live. We cannot hoard it. We can make our community more equitable and more livable. Be bold and hopeful. Don't let fear and selfishness win.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Hi, Please don't change Kirkland doing. It will make it harder for us to commute due to traffic. It is already condense.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The Houghton Neighborhood Association (HNA), on behalf of our membership, fully rejects the transportation corridor land use proposal LU-2.4 you are considering.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Opposed to Par Mac request as there is not enough infrastructure support which has already been negatively impacted by the growth allowed in Totem Lake.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Regarding Land Use Element policy 2.4: First, a quick request regarding a word in the discussion portion of 2.4. The discussion includes the sentence, “Specifically, enabling and encouraging housing production should be focused in areas that are high opportunity, such as areas with transit corridors and that</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I agree with the comments from the Houghton Neighborhood Association that you received. I would hope that you would listen to those who live in the community and do the right thing for Kirkland and its residence, the growth plan with the Transit Corridor is not doing that. I want to thank the two council members (Pascal and Tymczyszyn) that have listened and put Kirkland first. Its my understanding that this is who is supporting and against the proposal.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates “Residential” land use designations. Changing all these areas to “Residential Mixed Use” is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I live in the Everest neighborhood between the park and 6th st and I am emailing you to speak in favor of the proposed changes allowing for more affordable housing in Kirkland along key transit corridors. I grew up in Kirkland and have many friends who grew up here as well, it is heartbreaking seeing so many of them forced to move away from Kirkland because they are unable to afford to buy in the city. I find myself lucky, as I have inherited a residence in Kirkland, but I am still afraid that with the market appreciation and increase in property taxes, it won't be sustainable for me to live here long term. Allowing for more homes will stabilize rents and appreciation and allow for a more accessible place to live for me and others like me in the future.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a long time resident, over 35 years, of Kirkland....I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I just watched this video ( <a href="https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlLyS8x1gZo">https://www.youtube.com/watch?v=JlLyS8x1gZo</a> ) about a fight over some bike lanes in Montreal. "What does that have to do with Kirkland?" you might ask. Good question. I think there are some really strong parallels with the meeting the video narrator describes and what's happening here in Kirkland. It's honestly kind of eerie. I realize it is transportation in this case versus housing in our case, but the ideas of "process vs. substance", grievances vs solutions, and especially the "why are you all clapping for the guy saying all bike lanes should be stopped if you support bike lanes but just wanted to be more involved in the decision/design?" seem to be common to both cases. I heard many people applauding folks saying that LU-2.4 should be completely stricken, as opposed to modified, scoped, or re-thought. I think this belies the true agenda of folks claiming a lack of transparency or a problem with the processes we have gone through/will go through.....
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	We would like to take the time to write in opposition to the proposed Transit Corridor and potential opportunity to have future high density within Kirkland's neighborhoods. As a developer I understand growth targets and City future planning efforts. I believe this plan is severely flawed and not thought through for a number of reasons: 1. Kirkland's residential neighborhoods are one of the City's gems. These are places people enjoy the quieter, peaceful surroundings to raise families on streets that are safe and traffic is reduced. House Bill 1110 already allows for a lot of future Middle Housing in these neighborhoods and the City needs to provide time to see how that changes the neighborhoods. Taking the drastic Comp Plan step proposed is way overarching and taking neighborhoods from 1 to 100. HB 1110 is a good small step to allow density and evaluate traffic impacts but maintain character. 2. The 1/4 mile corridors envelope almost all of the neighborhoods.....This proposal could lead to very disjointed and mish mash of growth in these areas. Growth should be centralized in areas with roads and services that can support this proposal. Station Area was recently upzoned and there are areas of Kingsgate and Juanita that could support further growth where roads, services, proximity to freeways and transit already exist. The City should utilize that growth potential first and revisit this after 2044. These areas can support traffic. The neighborhoods cannot and to think new transit corridors will reduce traffic would require much more evaluation. This high density development is not necessary to meet future state growth requirements. The City has housing surplus on housing targets, so why implement this now?
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I live near Totem Lake, on Slater Avenue, and I'm writing you today to show my wholehearted support for the proposed changes to allow for more affordable housing in Kirkland. I spend most of my time in downtown Kirkland, at the library and the small businesses, enjoying the waterfront, events, and green spaces. Unfortunately, due to the dramatic increases in rent and cost of living in the area, I will be forced to move out of Kirkland within the next couple of years. This is truly devastating - I've spent the last four years building a life for myself here, and I can easily see myself living here for the rest of my life. I would love to buy a home here. ...Building new homes will help stabilize the soaring rent prices, allow for more affordable housing options, and give renters the choice to find a better apartment if their landlords treat them poorly. It would allow me to stay in Kirkland and to continue enjoying this truly beautiful city.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I live in the Everest Neighborhood between the park and 6th st, and I am emailing you to speak in favor of the proposed changes that will allow for more affordable housing in Kirkland along key transit corridors. I currently live and work in Kirkland and have many friends and coworkers who live in or are from Kirkland. It's demoralizing seeing my friends and coworkers leaving the area because they can't afford to live here. I have goals to live in my own apartment or buy my own condo, but instead I live with multiple roommates so I can afford to live in Kirkland. I support these proposed changes. I hope I can one day fulfill my dream of having my own place in Kirkland, these changes can help make that dream a reality.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	Object to Policy proposing drastic changes to the current Land Use Element of the proposed update to Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan. I have read through the briefing that was dated July 26, 2024. This briefing outlines changes to the Comprehensive Plan that are not in the best interest of the current residents of Kirkland that live in the neighborhoods where these changes are proposed. It will change existing neighborhoods into high density, urban areas.. As a citizen of Kirkland for more than 50 years, I am not in favor of these changes. ....

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I support the transportation corridor proposal and in disagreement with the Houghton Neighborhood Association which is claiming that to represent the views of my neighborhood. I am very supportive of increasing density and improving access to affordable housing and improved transit. I do not believe Houghton/Lakeview should only be a neighborhood for people who can afford a \$2.5 million dollar home, nor do I believe that almost exclusively single family homes are the best use of the very important transit corridor that exists through our neighborhood.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am emailing you to express my support for abundant housing of all types in Kirkland, especially missing middle housing along transit corridors. I currently live in the Moss Bay neighborhood, which is a neighborhood largely encompassed by the proposed frequent transit corridor overlay as detailed in the K2044 Comprehensive Plan Draft. I wholeheartedly support this direction for the K2044 document because we are facing a housing shortage that can only be solved by building more housing. We must chart a new path forward as a community and remove barriers to housing throughout Kirkland. You have a unique opportunity to stand behind the strong vision you have co-created in the draft Comprehensive Plan and you must not back down now. To back down at this point is to give in to the legacy of exclusion that set our current housing crises in motion. Our community has been faced with this choice between housing abundance and exclusion in the past and chose to exclude members of the community and set the groundwork for the housing crises we are experiencing today (History of Exclusion in Kirkland). The housing shortage has directly affected me because many of my friends, family, and community members who I have deep connections with have been forced to move outside of Kirkland due to high housing costs. Upon speaking with others in the community, it's clear this severance of physical bonds is unfortunately all too common in Kirkland today. I worry that the next generation of kids and young adults will be forced to repeat this cycle as housing prices continue to increase, shutting them out. Young people are rejecting car ownership at higher rates and prefer living in walkable neighborhoods. During summer break, downtown Kirkland is filled with kids and young adults who chose public transportation or active transportation, such as ebikes, as their preferred method of getting around town. Our current housing supply is not sufficient enough to affordably house these kids once they transition to adulthood and our community will remain worse off if we fail to build walkable housing and densify. I want more abundant missing middle housing that is sustainably sited near transit, because these future new housing developments will be filled with our friends and families. These yet-to-be-built houses represent a path to strengthen our community and will allow us to mend connections that are commonly broken today when housing is so difficult to access.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>THE GOOD: As residents of the Houghton area, we have tried to do our very best to live in a harmonious neighborhood, a place that we can call home. Thus far, I think we have done a good job, and we have a good idea how we would like our neighborhood to be: safe, clean, sustainable, welcoming, and a place where our kids can enjoy, grow and be happy.</p> <p>THE BAD: I understand that there is a housing crisis nationwide, and the greater Seattle area is not immune to it. However, building high-density housing for the sake of building, without careful planning and long-term vision, brings great peril. ... More concretely, what is sustainable about the "Comprehensive Plan" that you present, and do you have a "clear plan" to solve the inevitable problems/needs that will come with high-density housing like traffic, parking, air and noise pollution, trash, new schools, water, etc.?</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As Kirkland residents for almost 60 years, my wife and I urge you to heavily weigh the voice of the many Kirkland residents like us who have lived, played, raised families, and invested in our community over the years. We are in strong opposition to the addition of policy LU-2.4, to the comprehensive plan. Pursuing these changes especially considering the proposed density targets being met in 2044 seems frivolous. Higher density in areas which are not designed for such, will only serve to lower property values due to compounding the current street parking and public safety issue in our neighborhoods. LU-2.4 and the proposed changes to the current zoning codes in our neighborhoods, is a serious affront to the quality of life which makes Kirkland the community we have been proud to call our home.</p> <p>THE UGLY: Dear Kirkland Council Members, all of you are elected officials. This means that in the past you asked for our vote to get your current job. As democratically elected officials, would you move forward with a "Comprehensive Plan" that is highly unpopular, or would you, as a democratically elected member, listen to the Houghton community and send the proposal to vote so we can decide as a community?</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element but it is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	It appears the city is looking at this process as not a reclassification of property (when it technically is) therefore, additional public notice is not required. This is a process "loop-hole" since, any rezone needs to match the comprehensive plan map designation and comprehensive plan doesn't require notifying private property owners. Comprehensive Plan Map is the main component of a rezone. I have years of personal experience with this. I wish the staff would be more transparent with the public and provide additional public notice. Please. Why not?

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Summarized- We opposed future high density within Kirkland's neighborhoods along transit corridors. As a developer I understand growth targets and City future planning efforts. I believe this plan is severely flawed and not thought through for a number of reasons:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kirkland's residential neighborhoods are one of the City's gems. These are places people enjoy the quieter, peaceful surroundings to raise families on streets that are safe and traffic is reduced. House Bill 1110 already allows for a lot of future Middle Housing in these neighborhoods and the City needs to provide time to see how that changes the neighborhoods. Taking the drastic Comp Plan step proposed is way overarching and taking neighborhoods from 1 to 100. HB 1110 is a good small step to allow density and evaluate traffic impacts but maintain character.</li> <li>2. The 1/4 mile corridors envelope almost all of the neighborhoods. This proposal could lead to very disjointed and mish mash of growth in these areas. Growth should be centralized in areas with roads and services that can support this proposal such as Station Area, Kingsgate and Juanita that could support further growth where roads, services, proximity to freeways and transit already exist. The City should utilize that growth potential first and revisit this after 2044. These areas can support traffic. The neighborhoods cannot and to think new transit corridors will reduce traffic would require much more evaluation.</li> </ol> <p>This high density development is not necessary to meet future state growth requirements. The City has housing surplus on housing targets, so why implement this now? I strongly encourage the City to kill this part of the Comp Plan 2044, maintain neighborhood character and livability and focus growth in areas that support this kind of development and growth.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I support studying increasing density along transit corridors. One of the most pressing issues facing our entire region is the rising cost of housing, which has made it difficult for young people, families, and workers to afford to live in our city. We need to provide more diverse and affordable housing options not only for young people who are looking for a place to live, but also to strengthen the social and economic fabric of our community. Development of housing has long been limited by zoning policies that bend to a small number of vocal constituents, often at the expense of broader community needs. It's important that we preserve the distinct character of Kirkland, but at the same time we need to prioritize the future of Kirkland as a whole...we need to update the outdated laws and regulations that have made it hard to build homes for the working people in this community.</p> <p>Trying to freeze the city as it is will not keep it from changing. I urge you to support the study of increased housing density along transit corridors. It is a practical step toward fixing our housing challenges and an essential step toward building a more sustainable and vibrant city for future generations.</p>
8/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Kirkland is the only waterfront city located on the Eastside of Lake Washington. It's a place that people from around the area aspire to live, and in itself, it encourages people to achieve a better life. As with any "paradise," not everyone can achieve the dream of living in Kirkland. But is that a reason to change the character of Kirkland and degrade the atmosphere that makes it desirable?</p> <p>Since COVID-19, the city has been working in a bubble and not listening to the wants and needs of its population. Instead, it is working to change the population dynamic to fit a narrative that everyone deserves an equal share of anything they want. The promise of America is the freedom to earn whatever you desire but not to have it given to you by the government.</p> <p>Each of the Kirkland neighborhoods has its distinct character. Diluting that character will not serve the best interests of the people of Kirkland. Each citizen has their own story of how they came to live in Kirkland. The stories mostly begin with a struggle, a desire, and hard work to earn a spot. The current residents hold this in common.</p> <p>The citizens are not behind the proposed changes to zoning and upscaling, either in the downtown core or the residential neighborhoods. Our shared vision is not yours, and Kirkland has already met the legal standards for population and job growth. A new set of legislators will come, and we cannot reverse the damage to the Kirkland way of life</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my husband and children, are residents of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Apparently this Thursday's meeting is going to get a lot of open comment. In the interest of sparing you yet another two minutes, I beg you to not adopt LU2.4 as proposed. It shows ALL of Houghton as a transit corridor for consideration of higher density zoning. This is madness: we only have two lanes into our neighborhood and two lanes out (LW Blvd and 108th) and those lanes are already so densely utilized that it's easier for residents of our neighborhood to get to groceries and soccer practices held in Bellevue. Increasing the density of our neighborhood will further alienate residents down here from the city of Kirkland, so you need to take the inane LU2.4 proposal off the table. If LU2.4 is adopted as proposed, then I am very confident there will be well organized challengers from our neighborhood running for every available city council seat, next cycle</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, have lived in Kirkland for the past 26 years. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a long term resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my husband and children, are residents of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my wife, am a resident of Kirkland. we are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>We are also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. We strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I, along with my wife, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My husband and I are long-time residents of Kirkland, in Houghton. We settled here and raised a family because it was literally the perfect "bedroom" community. ....Part of the charm of this town is in its diversity, but also in that it always felt like a community and safe. I fear the Kirkland we know and love is on the brink of being lost. When a neighborhood of previously entirely single-family homes can suddenly face a 4 - 6 story building in their backyard, this causes a stress and dynamic that will forever damage our town. Our streets are already burdened with traffic, schools are overflowing. This plan to increase density in the 108th/Houghton area is ill-researched and very unpopular with your constituents. Please pause for a moment, imagine you live in a neighborhood you love, with neighbors who care for you, and you're suddenly faced with a giant building next door. This makes no sense. Our beautiful town does not have the capacity to take on high density housing, and it shouldn't have to. I beg you - please stop and think. Keep Kirkland small and charming. We all love it just the way it is</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My husband and I are long-time residents of Kirkland, in Houghton. We settled here and raised a family because it was literally the perfect "bedroom" community. Close enough to the city, yet suburban enough to feel safe and "neighborly". The proximity to the lake along with public beaches, beautiful boulevard with shops and restaurants made it even better. In fact, when deciding between moving to Kirkland or West Bellevue, we chose Kirkland because of its eclectic nature. Part of the charm of this town is in its diversity, but also in that it always felt like a community and safe.</p> <p>I fear the Kirkland we know and love is on the brink of being lost. When a neighborhood of previously entirely single-family homes can suddenly face a 4 - 6 story building in their backyard, this causes a stress and dynamic that will forever damage our town. Our streets are already burdened with traffic, schools are overflowing. This plan to increase density in the 108th/Houghton area is ill-researched and very unpopular with your constituents. Please pause for a moment, imagine you live in a neighborhood you love, with neighbors who care for you, and you're suddenly faced with a giant building next door. This makes no sense. Our beautiful town does not have the capacity to take on high density housing, and it shouldn't have to. I beg you - please stop and think. Keep Kirkland small and charming. We all love it just the way it is.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Kirkland is the only waterfront city located on the Eastside of Lake Washington. It's a place that people from around the area aspire to live, and in itself, it encourages people to achieve a better life. As with any "paradise," not everyone can achieve the dream of living in Kirkland. But is that a reason to change the character of Kirkland and degrade the atmosphere that makes it desirable?</p> <p>Since COVID-19, the city has been working in a bubble and not listening to the wants and needs of its population. Instead, it is working to change the population dynamic to fit a narrative that everyone deserves an equal share of anything they want. The promise of America is the freedom to earn whatever you desire but not to have it given to you by the government.</p> <p>Each of the Kirkland neighborhoods has its distinct character. Diluting that character will not serve the best interests of the people of Kirkland. Each citizen has their own story of how they came to live in Kirkland. The stories mostly begin with a struggle, a desire, and hard work to earn a spot. The current residents hold this in common.</p> <p>The citizens are not behind the proposed changes to zoning and upscaling, either in the downtown core or the residential neighborhoods. Our shared vision is not yours, and Kirkland has already met the legal standards for population and job growth. A new set of legislators will come, and we cannot reverse the damage to the Kirkland way of life.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I live in Houghton, and I am very concerned about the proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. My areas of concern are many—for example, I invite you to stand in my driveway and watch the traffic at 5pm and imagine what it would be like with far denser housing—but I will focus on just two things today.</p> <p>First, I will focus on the fact that the City chose to bring this proposal forward in the sleepy days of August, without notifying the people who would be impacted—please don't tell me a letter was sent; I didn't receive a letter, and neither did a single person I've talked to about this—and without bringing it to a vote, and then said that most neighborhoods don't seem to object. It's true, I didn't object sooner—because the City seems not to have notified me about something that they knew would have a huge impact on me, much less bring it to a vote for a democratic decision. It almost feels like the government that is supposed to represent me knew they were doing something their constituency would hate, and tried to sneak it through under the radar. I hope that's not the case, but I am very disappointed if it is.</p> <p>Second, I want to share a brief story. 14 years ago, my wife and I fell in love with a lot and the neighborhood in Houghton, and decided to build a deeply green enclave in the City. The property sloped downhill, so with the City height limit, the beautiful view could never be blocked. And because of the height limit, no neighbor could block the sun for solar collectors or a garden. So we built a house that had the second highest LEED score ever recorded at the time, put in a bank of solar collectors large enough to get us close to net zero, planted fruit trees, put in a large vegetable garden, and let a big chunk of the property grow biomass to capture carbon and nurture wildlife. And we designed the house so that as we aged we could continue to live there. It was the house—and the neighborhood—we planned to retire in.</p> <p>Now, of course, all that is threatened. We trusted the City and built something special at great cost, and now the City is proposing to betray that trust, destroying both the magic and the value of what we've built.</p> <p>Like us, thousands of people paid a premium for houses in quiet residential neighborhoods that were protected by zoning, in many cases with views that were protected by Kirkland's height limit. Those homes are not only where many hoped to retire and where many others hoped to raise a family, but also for many people the financial key to a comfortable retirement. All that is now put at risk. The City is proposing taking hundreds of millions of dollars of property value from existing homeowners and taxpayers, in order to benefit developers and hypothetical future residents. (And if the City wants more low-income housing, then it should pay for it, rather than making those with the misfortune to be within ¼ mile of a transit corridor bear the cost.) The City could have proposed reasonable 2 story apartments, which would have greatly increased density and fit into the neighborhoods organically, would not have had such a drastic effect on traffic, and wouldn't have blocked views and sun, but instead the City is proposing a hugely disruptive approach that has zero benefit and huge downside for current homeowners. Let's not mince words: whoever the City imagines they are helping with this proposal, it's not the people who actually live in this city and love it, the people who elected the City Council and who pay the taxes that enable the City to function. As well you know, many of the people agitating for this change are not from Kirkland, and many of the people who will speak to the Planning Commission Thursday are likewise not residents. It is bizarre to me that the City is listening to them rather than the people the City represents and works for, and stranger still to see that the City is prioritizing developers...</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>-The 2044 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element proposal seems only to benefit developers. It does not benefit the existing residents of Kirkland.</p> <p>-The current 2044 Comprehensive Plan Land Use Element document should be sent back to the planning department for rework. There is no point in even suggesting that 6 story buildings should be allowed in many of the areas suggested. The 1/2 mile corridor width (1/4 mile in each direction) invades many fine Kirkland neighborhoods and makes no sense. Most of the neighborhoods involved make no sense for affordable housing as a small house lot is approaching \$1M. There are many locations, most actually facing the transit corridor streets, that are sensible locations. 7th Avenue between 6th street and the 114th connection to 85th has many possibilities. There is no need to threaten neighborhoods.</p> <p>-Affordable housing is a worthy goal, but it MUST NOT change the character of the city.</p> <p>-The public hearings held to discuss the plan were not announced as the start of a new and massive zoning change. After the plan is reworked, new public hearings should be held and announced in plain English as including zoning changes.</p> <p>-The planning department seems to speak in a special language designed to confuse. You should refuse to listen to presentations like the one given at the August 7 council meeting. Make the planning department always use normal English that the whole community can understand.</p> <p>Thanks for reviewing these ideas. I think the first item is worth reading again. Why would someone make a proposal that doesn't improve the city? Transit in sensible ways does improve the city. These proposed corridors with massive zoning changes DO NOT IMPROVE Kirkland.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>- The City's 6th Street Corridor Study completed in December 2017 shows that the corridor has significant congestion and transportation safety issues without extensive new development. Now the City wants to add more development traffic in addition to that proposed for the Houghton Village (Old PCC) site?</p> <p>- Higher density would be allowed 1/4 mile east and west of 108th, noting that people can access transit, such as the future K-line. Metro's Rapid Ride (K-line) proposes stops every 1/2 mile. If you live 1/4 mile east or west of 108th Ave NE midway between two stops, as a minimum you must walk 1/2 mile to access transit. Of course, you probably have to walk further since you have to get to a street that connects to 108th first. People may drive and park on side streets near 108th, like they did when the South Kirkland P &amp; R lot was being redeveloped. That was a real mess with people parking too close to the intersections at NE 60th and NE 62nd, as well as encroaching on driveways.</p> <p>- The higher density plan generally calls for limited on-site parking, resulting in more on-street parking and possible conflicts with pedestrians and bicyclists.</p> <p>Transit Service</p> <p>- There has been no discussion of any transit service along 108th Avenue NE except for K-line. Will there be any access for people that can't walk as far as a 1/2 mile to access a bus stop?</p> <p>- The transit queue jump lanes, as identified in the 6th Street Corridor Study are for northbound transit at NE 60th and NE 68th Street. That was the most that could be accomplished without widening 108th Ave to five lanes. It sounds like Metro would like full lanes from NE 53rd Street to NE 68th Street in both directions. If that is the case, why D36 wasn't that noted in the Corridor Study – seems like bait and switch. Widening 108th to five lanes, including north and southbound transit only lanes would be very costly, will greatly change the character of the main street serving Houghton, and wasn't ever part of the City's Transportation, Neighborhood, or Comprehensive Plan processes. The wider street also will increase crossing distances for pedestrians and will encourage higher traffic speeds, thereby impacting safety.</p> <p>Houghton Village</p> <p>- Again, a study, paid for by the City taxpayers, identified the types and level of land uses (and traffic generated) with redevelopment of the Houghton Village. The City Council didn't like the results when they adopted that plan, so they decide, maybe we should buy it and start over and hell with the people that participated in that process (including the Planning Commission and neighborhood groups). We bought it, now we should figure out what to do with it – instead of, here is what we heard from the community and working toward solutions to help make that happen, with a lot less than \$14 million and another almost \$1 million to renovate the PCC building for an interim use for Studio East. Oops, did that even come across your collective minds? Spend and then decide – kind of like the Houghton Park and Ride – we'll build a pool and community complex (but the voters said NO, what shall we do?)</p> <p>- Let's look at things that will serve the broader community, instead of serving as a Neighborhood Commercial Center focused on providing goods and services within walking distance of the surrounding neighborhoods.</p> <p>- We are now talking about bringing in more traffic for people throughout the city and surrounding communities than even envisioned in the HENC plan. For what purpose? The adjacent neighborhoods need to get in their cars to access reasonably priced groceries, go to a restaurant that serves more than sub sandwiches, teriyaki or other take-out. How is that consistent with city policies to reduce transportation. Of course we could all ride the K-line, after walking as far as we should</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Three story high buildings max! Is the city buying property along 108th for transit access and additional lanes? Horrible design and usage. Traffic lights would be needed at every intersection to allow people to who live E and W to enter 108th.</p> <p>Clearly no one who is on the council or planning commission live in these areas. Has anyone considered parking? Most underground parking is very poor and unsafe. The impact on the school needs consideration. When is the city buying NW College?</p> <p>What is the city's agenda? Since the recent information is very late in being sent out this all seems irregular. From an unhappy resident of 47 years.....</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing in support of the 2044 Comprehensive Plan (K2044) &amp; Kirkland Neighborhood Densification. As someone who owns a home in the Norkirk neighborhood of Kirkland and works in Kirkland, I believe that we need to dramatically increase the housing supply in Kirkland, and provide more housing units of all types - including missing middle housing. More housing units means less competition for housing of all sizes and types, which in turn means we can slow down the insane increases in the price of housing.</p> <p>More reasonably-priced housing means more of my colleagues can also both live and work in Kirkland. They can then enjoy the benefits I currently have, like the ability to walk, bike, or easily bus to work. Every person who can both live and work in Kirkland is one more person we're keeping off the already horribly clogged highways.</p> <p>While in a heavily populated area like Kirkland there is never an ideal place to add density, the transit zones identified in the K2044 plan (which includes my street near Market St.) are reasonable places to zone for greater density and height.</p> <p>However, I do ask that the city work with other stakeholders like PSE, Metro, and the county to ensure that all our essential infrastructure (e.g. electricity, water, sewer, road capacity, parks, bus route coverage, parking etc) are appropriately scaled as part of this plan to ensure there is no degradation of services. For example, please ensure that new town homes, duplexes, triplexes, and/or small apartment buildings are required to include underground parking. As a practical matter, the plan should also consider requiring developers to compensate existing homeowners when new construction directly impacts their property values (e.g. when building a 4-story apartment impedes a lake view).</p> <p>Finally, I'm sure that City Council and the Planning Commission are getting an earful from the Neighborhood NIMBYs right now. Do not bow to their pressure. Keep up the good fight for 10-minute neighborhoods, affordable housing, and mixed-use housing knowing that you have my support.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Hello, Council and Planning Commission. I am writing to express my *support* of this plan. As a long time resident of the Market neighborhood (I've lived on 8th Avenue West since 2003), I am 100% supportive of efforts to increase density and transit capacity in the area. We have a great city, and I would like it to be more affordable so more can enjoy it, so please press forward on plans to increase density and get more housing built!</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I've been going over the updated draft for LU-2.4 in the Comp Plan. I feel that the updated policy has some strong regressions (and a few improvements):</p> <p>Regression: Planning is predicated on the Station Area Plan. While we all have high hopes for the Station Area Plan the fact remains that we have no guarantee when those hopes will be realized or if they'll have sufficient impact when they are. In the meantime our housing situation may continue to deteriorate. Can we not walk and chew gum at the same time? If we believe that adding density to transit corridors is a good idea why does it need to wait until after the Station Area to even be studied?</p> <p>Regression: Planning criteria is not clear for the average community member. What does "a number of residential units with vested permits equal to the affordable housing pioneer provision" mean? This passage is in sharp contrast from the rest of the Comprehensive Plan which takes a high level view of where the city would like to be in 20 years. This wording is, instead, both very specific and very unclear. This is a document meant for the average person, not city staff. Please make it easy to understand and more general in language.</p> <p>Improvement: Specifying that transit corridors will be considered individually. This addresses a key concern that we've heard from the community without compromising the goal of this policy.</p> <p>Improvement: Specifying transit corridor priority. While perhaps redundant with common sense I think this is a reasonable addition to make clear where we anticipate the most benefit from this policy.</p> <p>Regression: Specifying public process and decision criteria. I appreciate that this is added to refute misinformation that's been spreading in the community about how the Comp Plan process works. However I think it's redundant to print here and creates opportunity for confusion if the city's processes are adjusted before the next update. Our city's high level planning document should not require a primer on public process in exactly one of its policies just because that one happened to bear the brunt of public scrutiny.</p> <p>I appreciate all the iterations you've put this policy through and I'm glad to see an attempt to address public concerns without sacrificing the city's housing goals. Thank you for all your hard work and hope we'll be able to coalesce on a simpler policy without unnecessary delays to addressing today's housing pain.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I appreciate the additional context that has been added via the new framework section of LU-2.4 in the latest draft of the Land Use Element for next week's Planning Commission packet. It's helpful to have all of the context in one place regarding how the city will implement this policy, even if it's re-iterating existing city procedures. However, I'm quite disappointed by the changes to the first paragraph of the policy.</p> <p>The policy now calls for the city to explore increased density "once the NE 85th St Station Area residential development has achieved a number of residential units with vested permits equal to the affordable housing pioneer provision". I support the notion that any work to study density and update zoning along transit corridors should not come at the expense of the Station Area Plan. However, I think this requirement is too specific. Because the comprehensive plan is such a long range planning document, I don't think it's a good idea to restrict the city's options at this time. I got the impression that the majority of the council was also thinking along these lines. There was discussion about clarity, prioritization and timing, but I also heard desire to avoid locking things down. Also, I think this requirement has a lot of technical terms that a general reader won't understand, which is in stark contrast to the clarity offered by the text added later in the policy. The next part of the policy reads "and ensure development regulations enable diverse housing options and small-scale retail and commercial opportunities." This feels like a separate topic to the core issue of "study more housing density near transit corridors", so it makes the policy less streamlined. I think this would fit in better in the "decisional criteria" at the end of the policy.</p> <p>The new draft does a great job outlining the city's intent and process.</p> <p>Please don't limit our options now. I believe the planning work program process and the study itself should inform how and when we move forward with implementing zoning changes in these areas</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am opposed of the frequent transit proposal. I encourage the City to install public notice signs along the proposed transit coordinators and mailings to the appropriate 7000 tax parcels and boarding tax parcels. Please do not have the Planning Commission make any recommendations until property owners and boarding tax parcels have been notified. The Comprehensive Plan Map is 90% of the rezone process. I feel the Planning Department has been discounting this issue and they are letting the Planning Commission run without educating them. Again, I oppose the frequent transit designation as proposed. There are better locations which will have a greater impact on affordable housing ( K line, one story old strip malls with huge surface parking lots, transit station at south Kirkland near 520). I am disappointed in the current plan and decision not to notify property owners.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I would like to see a plan to expand the roads before you approve more density. For example, Lake WA Blvd and Juanita Drive are already congested. How would we accommodate more apartments and condos, whose residents presumably will each bring one or two cars to the neighborhood? Rush hour traffic is already unbearable. What's the road expansion plan around Juanita Drive and Lake WA Blvd. Let's figure that out first.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Increasing the density in already dense areas is an awful idea. How are we supposed to get around town?</p>
8/18/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing in support of the 2044 comprehensive plan (K2044) &amp; kirkland neighborhood densification. As someone who owns a home in the Norkirk neighborhood and works in Kirkland, I believe that we need to dramatically increase the housing supply in Kirkland, and provide more housing units of all types - including missing middle housing. More housing units means less competition for housing of all sizes and types, which in turn means we can slow down the insane increases in the price of housing. More reasonably-priced housing means more of my colleagues can also both live and work in Kirkland. They can then enjoy the benefits I currently have, like the ability to walk, bike, or easily take the bus to work. Every person who can both live and work in Kirkland is one more person we're keeping off the horribly clogged highways. While in a heavily populated area like Kirkland there is never an ideal place to add density, the transit zones identified in the K2044 plan (which includes my street near Market St) are reasonable places to zone for greater density and height. However, I do ask that the city work with other stakeholders like PSE, Metro, and the county to ensure that all our essential infrastructure (electricity, water, sewer, road capacity, parks, bus route coverage, parking, etc) are appropriately scaled as part of this plan to ensure there is no degradation of services. For example, please ensure that new townhomes, duplexes, triplexes, and/or small apartment buildings are required to include underground parking. As a practical matter, the plan should also consider requiring developers to compensate existing homeowners when new construction directly impacts their property values (e.g., when building a 4-story apartment impedes a lake view). Finally, I'm sure that the council and planning commission are getting an earful from the neighborhood NIMBYs. Do not bow to their pressure. Keep up the good fight for 10-minute neighborhoods, affordable housing, and mixed-use housing knowing that you have my support.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/16/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I've been going over the update draft for LU-2.4 in the comp plan. I feel that the updated policy has some strong regressions (and a few improvements). Regression: Planning is predicated on the station area plan. While we all have high hopes for the station area plan the fact remains that we have no guarantee when those hopes will be realized or if they'll have sufficient impact when they are. In the meantime our housing situation may continue to deteriorate. Can we not walk and chew gum at the same time? If we believe that adding density to transit corridors is a good idea why does it need to wait until after the station area to even be studied? Regression: Planning criteria is not clear for the average community member. What does "a number of residential units with vested permits equal to the affordable housing provision" mean? This passage is in sharp contrast to the rest of the comp plan which takes a high level view of where the city would like to be in 20 years. This wording is, instead, both very specific and very unclear. This is a document meant for the average person, not city staff. Please make it easy to understand and more general in language. Improvement: Specifying that transit corridors will be considered individually. This addresses a key concern that we've heard from the community without compromising the goal of this policy. Improvement: Specifying transit corridor priority. While perhaps redundant with common sense I think this is a reasonable addition to make clear where we anticipate the most benefit from this policy. Regression: Specifying public process and decision criteria. I appreciate that this is added to refute misinformation that's been spreading in the community about how the comp plan process works. However I think it's redundant to print here and created opportunity for confusion if the city's processes are adjusted before the next update. Our city's high level planning document should not require a primer on public processes in exactly one of its policies just because that one happened to bear the brunt of public scrutiny. I appreciate all the iterations you've put this policy through and I'm glad to see an attempt to address public concerns without sacrificing the city's housing goals. Thank you for all your hard work and hope we'll be able to coalesce on a similar policy without unnecessary delays to addressing today's housing pain.</p>
8/16/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I appreciate the additional context that has been added via the new framework section of LU-2.4 in the latest draft of the land use element for the planning commission packet. It's helpful to have all the context in one place regarding how the city will implement this policy, even if it's re-iterating existing city procedures. However, I'm quite disappointed by the changes to the first paragraph of the policy. The policy now calls for the city to explore increased density "once the NE 85th St Station Area residential development has achieved a number of residential units with vested permits equal to the affordable housing pioneer provision". I support the notion that any work to study density and update zoning along transit corridors should not come at the expense of the station area plan. However, I think this requirement is too specific. Because the comprehensive plan is such a long range planning document, I don't think it's a good idea to restrict the city's options at this time. I got the impression that the majority of the council was also thinking along these lines. There was discussion about clarity, prioritization, and timing, but I also heard a desire to avoid locking things down. Also, I think this requirement has a lot of technical terms that a general reader won't understand, which is in stark contrast to the clarity offered by the text added later in the policy. The next part of the policy reads "and ensure development regulations enable diverse housing options and small-scale retail and commercial opportunities." This feels like a separate topic to the core issue of "study more housing density near transit corridors", so it makes the policy less streamlined. I think this would fit better in the "decisional criteria" at the end of the policy. The new draft does a great job outlining the city's intent and process. Please don't limit our options now. I believe the planning work program process and the study itself should inform how and when we move forward with implementing zoning changes in these areas.</p>
8/16/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing to express some frustration with the updated LU-2.4 policy in the packet for the meeting on Thursday. Adding "once the NE 85th St Station Area residential development has achieved a number of residential units with vested permits equal to the affordable housing pioneer provision" to the policy seems misguided. If I'm someone who whose workplace lies along the 255 route and would benefit most from finding housing that allows me a 1-set ride to/from work, this updated policy seems to indicate that I'm less likely to see the housing I most need to get built (or even considered?) until all this housing is built somewhere else that doesn't meet my needs. Why would we hamstring our ability to meet the needs of our community like that?</p>
8/15/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to express my strong support for bold, transit-oriented housing strategies in Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan update. As a long-standing business in Kirkland, where we have had an office for over a decade our focus has been on developing both market-rate and affordable housing across the region. Through our work, we have witnessed firsthand the significant challenges our region faces due to the housing crisis. The scarcity of affordable housing is a growing concern, not only for those in need but for the entire community's economic and social well-being. Housing near transit routes is especially critical, as it allows residents to access jobs, education, and services without the burden of long commutes. I encourage the Commission to embrace a growth strategy that does not limit housing capacity, particularly around transit hubs. This is a unique opportunity for Kirkland to set a progressive example for the region, ensuring that our city remains inclusive and welcoming to people from all backgrounds. Please consider the urgency of this issue and the positive impact that increased housing capacity will have on the community. It takes approximately 5 years for new affordable units to be delivered to the market, so getting a start on this now is key. It's also important to recognize the necessary funding that will be required to deliver these income restricted units to the market. Without the funding, the free market will not be able to deliver the desired targets. I urge you to support robust residential growth and affordable housing initiatives in the Comprehensive Plan update.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/14/2024	Land Use Changes	Summary of comments... I am a telecommunication engineer and have over 23 years of experience with modeling and planning of cellular networks in major wireless carriers. ....As a Kirkland resident I drive in Market St every single day. This single lane road is already fairly loaded and it appears to reach its capacity with current zoning with current rate of additions of the ADU and ongoing subdivisions. The idea that this street can support the additional road traffic from multi-unit developments doesn't pass my 'smell test....' I would like to respectfully request your close attention to the 'ridership' assumptions in these modelings as a small miscalculation of this parameter can create a huge swing in our road calculation results.... I recommend that city planners provide the city council three sets of study based on three different ridership values. This will help us understand what will happen if we miss our ridership targets: to Current Ridership- to Midpoint between current and target Ridership -to Target Ridership. I would also ask the city council to pay close attention to the percentage of the developed lot. The staff may have 'up-zoned' the neighborhood but assumed only a low percentage of the properties would develop. This is something that could skew the results.
8/13/2024	Land Use Changes	Please note my strong opposition to the plan to permit 4-6 stories, up to 6 units on a single, standard lot in the TOC. I am also opposed to the revision to 108th Avenue NE. While I recognize that growth is inevitable and needs to be accommodated this is the wrong way to go about it. There is a current plan in place already adopted after much study and discussion so let's stick with it
8/13/2024	Land Use Changes	Response to Houghton Village site August meeting. I want to say I appreciate the city's efforts at expanding housing opportunities to allow more people to live in this great city. Even if this lot does not become housing please do not let a loud minority of residents block changes and growth in the city. I'm seeing petitions from this same group of residents to block any housing in my neighborhood. I would enjoy more people in my neighborhood and it's a shame that the nature of home ownership means that residents are financially incentivized to block new supply of housing. However, as the city leadership you can help to build and allow for growth and improvements in the city. Property values can rise with the addition of amenities, density, and public investment. By easing zoning restrictions, streamlining permitting processes, and improving city transit we can continue to grow well into the future. Additional housing will ease housing supply constraints, grow our tax base (to help fund city wide improvements), and allow Kirkland to welcome all of the people who want to enjoy the city.
8/13/2024	Land Use Changes	I am very strongly opposed to the absolutely insane proposal suggested by the Kirkland planning commission to allow 4-6 story units 1/4 mile into the single family residential neighborhoods on each side of 108th street between 53rd and 68th streets. fantastic view of the lake and the mountains. The absolutely last thing I want in the world is to have some developer build a 4-6 story apartment building right in front of us. This would also completely change the nature of the neighborhood and create more traffic and parking. Right now everyone has garages and there is no need to park in the street. Not the case with a 4-6 story apartment with no parking.
8/12/2024	Land Use Changes	I do not believe the current proposed plan achieves those goals and sincerely hope that you will reconsider the current proposal and make positive changes to the plan that first and foremost serve your current residents, who elected you to represent them and serve their best interests. What other proposals were considered but not included? Upzoning should only occur along thoroughfares (Market, 116th, 124th, Central, LK Wash Blvd.) not within single family areas. Any upzoning should be done in stages. What has been coordinated with METRO? What is planned for mitigating parking and traffic issues? There is no requirement that we immediately add 34% to the required density for the current Comp Plan cycle. I hope that you will reconsider the current proposal and direct the planning department to return to the drawing board and come up with a viable proposal that respects your citizens, our neighborhoods, thoughtful growth and the fact that you were elected to serve us.
8/12/2024	Land Use Changes	I write in opposition to proposed higher density in my own neighborhood, the Market neighborhood. Please put an immediate halt to the proposed zoning changes in the Comprehensive Plan for 2044. Safety, privacy, peace and quiet continue to be my top priority and some of the biggest reasons I choose Kirkland as my home. I have listened to many concerned citizens speaking in opposition to the proposed changes. I agree completely with all their points. Conduct your hearings in plain English language that the public can understand. Please act in accordance with the wishes of your constituents, and not some grand plan to leave a mark during your tenure as an elected official
8/12/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes to higher density in Market neighborhood. Please re-negotiate housing issues with King County. Please communicate in plain English, in public hearings and public notices.
8/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I do not support any council member who votes yes on high density housing units in SFR locations
8/8/2024	Land Use Changes	While I understand the need for increased housing in urban areas, I have observed significant issues resulting from existing high-density developments, such as the Slater 116 Apartments. During my observations, I noted considerable traffic congestion on Slater Avenue, making it difficult for residents to access their driveways. The planned expansion into residential neighborhoods poses several concerns including traffic congestion, a strain on our existing infrastructure, and a huge impact on our sense of community as residents of Kirkland
8/7/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes and density increases. Disappointed with the City's public engagement discussion related to this stage as policy direction and future zoning changes.
8/7/2024	Land Use Changes	Apartment complexes- I'm not convinced apartments will make things more affordable. Landlords continually raise rents requiring people to move. Landlords lack of maintenance. Need rent control. Proposed Land Use Map transit routes and designations need clarification and definitions.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/7/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to land use changes on transit corridors. In summary, this is what really matters to most of the citizens of Kirkland: People want to move to Kirkland because of its charm and unique character. Allowing the density that is proposed in the comprehensive plan would destroy the very reasons they want to move here in the first place. Kirkland grew into being organically over the course of many years and lifetimes by people of goodwill, people who actually lived here. For this reason, once it is destroyed, it can never be re-created. It is still a livable and desirable place to live, but it is fragile and would be forever destroyed if this comprehensive plan were to move forward.
8/5/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to high density growth plans because it will increase traffic congestion, strain on infrastructure, loss of green spaces, diminish quality of life and make Kirkland a less attractive place to live. Growth targets for our city have already been met. Continuing to push for additional high-density development seems unnecessary and counterproductive. Focus on maintaining and enhancing the character of our existing neighborhoods - or maybe constructing a few much needed sidewalks so we can walk safely in our neighborhoods. Reconsider these high-density growth plans and explore alternative approaches that align with community's values and preserve the unique character of Kirkland.
8/4/2024	Land Use Changes	Difficult to access complete staff reports on the proposed community-initiated amendments. Does not support staff's approach to comprehensive amendments without in-depth analysis.
7/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes- Rather than focusing on a minimal percentage of affordable units in 5-7 story buildings that would affect the livability of Kirkland's neighborhoods outside the core urban zones, why not encourage more ADU development on larger lots? Implementing a program that offers discounted utility rates or cash-back incentives for ADU owners who prove they offer below-market rents could provide a more sustainable and community-friendly approach to increasing affordable housing
7/26/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to Par Mac request due to business displacement and negative impacts on neighboring residential properties.
7/16/2024	Land Use Changes	We are just learning about this (neighborhood plan updates) and are horrified that this is even being considered in this part of the city. We love Kirkland in general and our neighborhood in particular. We also love living in the neighborhood, supporting local schools and are fortunate to have built out businesses, employing nearly 200 people in the area. It's therefore not a surprise that we would be horrified to learn about the potential zoning changes to the market neighborhood. The impact to traffic, children walking to school, degradation of property values (and associated tax revenue), views and livability of existing homes, and on would permanently erase all that is cherished by so many in this neighborhood. Driving down 16th right now is a small taste into what chaos this will cause. Cars randomly parked on roads and I have sadly personally witnessed children nearly being hit by drivers swerving to clear the road due to the newly introduced lack of visibility with the congested street. I urge you to reconsider this horrendous plan. The impact and associated backlash to this community must be avoided at all costs.
7/13/2024	Land Use Changes	The process doesn't represent the voice of the people. Clearly the city planners and most on the city council do not want to hear from their constituents and want density- severe consequences be damned. You as the planning commissioners owe the real tax payers a process that includes their voices and wants. This process mostly cuts us out of our own neighborhood planning process and policies. The traffic and infrastructure in Houghton is already maxed out with the current density. Just drive on 108th Ave or Lake Washington Blvd going North at 5 PM. Adding to the density without massive infrastructure overhaul is irresponsible and dangerous.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I am writing to express my concern regarding the lack of public notice for approximately 7,000 tax lots that are hatched 50 units to the acre (see attached PDF). I traveled each road in the Houghton, Norkrik and Market Neighborhoods and did not see a signal public notice sign referencing the 50 DUA installed. Many property owners are unaware of this proposal. 50 units an acre is a substantial change. Please better inform the property owners with proper public notice signs. The Comprehensive Plan Map is the main component of a rezone. Any rezone must match the Comprehensive Plan Map. Essentially the Comprehensive Plan map is 90% of the rezone process and should not be discounted. So often the public is startled by a rezone and they ask how and why can it happen. It can happen because the comprehensive plan map allows it. Again, the comprehensive plan map is the 1st step and the main step in the rezone..It can be challenging for the public to understand 800+ pages of a Comprehensive Plan Amendment and map and somewhat unfair. The Planning Department understands it but the majority of the public does not. Please be transparent to the property owners and provide Public Notice Signs so all 7000+ tax parcels are better aware. The Comprehensive Plan Map is 90% of the rezone process. Please postpone any July 11th recommendation until proper public notice has occurred. Be transparent with the public. I am opposed to: Extension of Market Street Corridor. Density increases along Market Street or Existing SF zones (current ADU ordinance is better for compatibility and scale)
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I am in support of allowing higher residential densities along frequent transit corridors. It is a way to preserve single-family housing while allowing more people to live in Kirkland near frequent transit corridors and support transit usage. The way to affordability is by allowing more residential units. I'm concerned that we have more jobs allocated for the area than we do housing units.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	We have been absolutely appalled by the senseless, headlong movement towards increased density far beyond any mandated growth management plan in recent decades. We fought the movement to allow increased density in Norkirk for years while Eric Shields was head of Kirkland Planning. We opposed the City's movement to dilute minimum lot sizes tooth and nail. This latest proposal to allow up to six story apartments along Market Street is the last straw. This is madness. You are turning this city into a Bellevue or worse, Seattle. That is not at all where we chose to live. We are ashamed of what the City of Kirkland council and commission are doing to ruin this once lovely city. We have made the decision to sell our home and move away from the City we once loved and to which we devoted so much energy.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	While I believe that Kirkland and other municipalities need to evolve, the proposed zoning changes around current transit corridors require much more study and public debate. If enacted, the changes will affect thousands of current Kirkland citizens, impacting property values, traffic patterns, view corridors, and livability. The Planning Commission has an obligation to the citizens of Kirkland to fully communicate the expected impact of the zoning changes, and I don't believe the Commission or the City has done this. The outcry you are hearing right now is proof that the communication of the proposed changes has been inadequate. I ask the Planning Commission to slow down, better communicate the options and alternatives, derive more feedback from the citizenry, and not bow to the demands of developers who want a quick buck.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I am concerned about the proposed changes, especially the relaxing of the building height restriction with a motivation to develop mid-rise buildings on Market street. For the homes on the first street, including ours, adjacent to Market street , the height restrictions help in enabling what little sunlight we receive. Obviously, the views are a major factor why we and other residents love this area. Relaxing the height limit will significantly reduce the amount of natural light and views that the neighboring residents currently enjoy. I and our neighbors in the community worry about the loss of openness, enclosed feeling, and potentially lower property values for our residences. With the increased sense of enclosure comes reduced privacy that taller buildings can bring to our homes. We feel that our personal spaces are overlooked and their backyards/windows are more exposed to the neighboring buildings. The Market street corridor is as-is very busy. Converting a largely residential neighborhood to a mixed business-residential setting, along with high-density buildings will make already problematic traffic and parking worse. We worry about worsening congestion, noise, and demand for limited parking spaces - negatively impacting our residential areas. I request that the city planning department carefully weigh the potential benefits of increased development against the impacts on the quality of life for residents who love this area and have made this our home for decades.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of our community. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighborhood unique.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	We have seen many changes starting in 1987 when our property was annexed from King County into the City of Kirkland. The apparent changes now proposed will forever change this neighborhood in a negative manner. The streets at peak traffic are already in excess of capacity. Adding the type of density proposed would be horrendous. We built our house here because we loved the environment of this neighborhood and this town. We did not make the investment to build a home and raise a family here to live with the thought that the city's view of how the neighborhood should look and feel would eventually be imposed on us.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	Allowing greater height and occupancy, plus taking away requirements for parking for multi-story buildings, will simply shove parking problems into other neighborhoods. This is easily seen where Seattle has done this. It will not force residents in the new buildings to abandon their cars, just create conflict with neighbors and stress for everyone. Only the developers benefit from this. More density equals more traffic. Market Street is already a cut through corridor, with perpendicular streets being used as well. Increasing density will create congestion and accidents. We don't have the infrastructure to keep adding density anywhere and everywhere in Kirkland, especially older Kirkland. Please quit chipping away at what makes Kirkland a lovely place to live, its history, human scale and scenery. We don't need more density in this lovely area. You've already met the density requirement of the growth plan, elsewhere.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	While I support the need for growth, I do not believe the city should be doing anything beyond trying to meet the growth requirements as laid out by king county and the state. These changes will have a huge negative impact on traffic, and the quality and feel of this town. You should honor existing limitations near the lake (ie not allowing taller than existing limits at the Michaels site). Additionally, I would love to see a study that shows residents in expensive Suburbs like Kirkland will use buses, when they can clearly afford cars and their time is more valuable to them than taking long circuitous trips on a bus, requiring transfers. It makes no sense to me.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	We have seen many changes starting in 1987 when our property was annexed from King County into the City of Kirkland. The apparent changes now proposed will forever change this neighborhood in a negative manner. The streets at peak traffic are already in excess of capacity. Adding the type of density proposed would be horrendous. We built our house here because we loved the environment of this neighborhood and this town. We did not make the investment to build a home and raise a family here to live with the thought that the city's view of how the neighborhood should look and feel would eventually be imposed on us.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	In addition to this idea not fitting the future vision of people who have chosen Kirkland as their home, there are both safety and congestion concerns with the proposed changes. This is already visible with the recent changes to downtown Kirkland, crime rates in the area, and traffic flows in an out of the city with recent development around Central Way. Increasing the building height and density allowed in the neighborhood, inviting additional traffic, and extending mixed-use buildings into residential neighborhoods will forever change the character, charm and attractiveness of the area.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	As someone who supports density, I suggest two alternative approaches: Tiered Density: Change the zoning for properties adjacent to frequent transit corridors to allow for high-density development with elevated height restrictions. This would create a gradual transition zone, with density decreasing as you move away from the corridor. This model is actually reflected in the density examples cited in the presentation. OR Retain Current Zoning: Maintain the existing 12-units/acre zoning and Policy MS-8, which limits building heights to 2-3 stories in the Market Street Corridor.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of the community. We, and many other members of our community, come to walk as a gateway to down town and to walk up for views and access to the tot lot and pea patch. We have been gardening in the Pea Patch for the past 6 years and enjoy the views and vistas we see as we stroll up and down 1st St.. as well as when we walk our dogs. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street, would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighborhood unique. As the gateway from lower density to higher density that currently exists provides a beautiful transition allowing Heritage Park to not feel overcrowded by buildings and give equal access to all to enjoy the views. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. We'd like to see plans that show how bus service and public transportation and safe cycling routes will be manifested before this plan is adopted.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	Housing costs are continuing to rise in Kirkland. Even as we're making good progress with gently increasing our city's density we're still trying to make up for decades of limiting housing supply. Until we (and the other cities in our area) catch up to where we should be we'll continue to have a Kirkland where only the rich can afford to live. I'm in support of more housing supply throughout our city but especially along transit corridors and in places where residents would have easy, car-free access to the amenities they need like grocery stores and schools. Please remember that capacity is not the same as development. Only a few lots at a time will be redeveloping to take advantage of newly allowed density so it's crucial that we maximize what we can get from this redevelopment. I know a lot of my fellow neighbors are concerned about the transportation implications from allowing multifamily units near single family housing. That's why it's so important that new housing is well placed so that new Kirkland residents aren't forced into the same car-reliance as our suburbs currently dictate. At the end of the day this is a value question: do we care more about people and giving them an affordable place to live, or do we care about cars and making sure drivers are never inconvenienced? As we grow as a city this question of how we handle our most space-inefficient transit mode will become more and more poignant. Cars are an important tool but they shouldn't be the only viable option in our city.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street has been an important walking and biking corridor for many decades. As a 30+ year resident, people have often told me that they walk and bike on First Street to avoid the congestion on Market Street when traveling across the Norkirk/Moss Bay neighborhoods from North to South or the reverse. Encouraging increased development along First Street will eliminate that pedestrian/bike friendly corridor. The suggestion that mass transportation will increase is somewhat doubtful to me. I used to be a regular bus commuter to Seattle, but the rerouting thru the UW to get onto Light Rail has tripled the commute time for local residents. I also urge you to maintain the current height restriction on Market Street. This limitation keeps the neighborhood maintains the characteristics of the neighborhood that is beloved.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	We are writing to echo the concerns already submitted by many residents of the market street area against the planned zoning and use changes being proposed. As long time Market Street area residents (we live on 1st) the proposed changes, particularly the allowance of higher buildings directly across the street obstructing our view and destroying property values are unacceptable. We would strongly urge the planning commission to re-consider any such proposal and respect the community in which this is being proposed.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>While I believe that Kirkland and other municipalities need to evolve, the proposed zoning changes around current transit corridors do not follow the planning and building departments guiding principles:</p> <p>Implement programs to provide housing to community members of all income levels and abilities. Does Kirkland City Council think waterfront units with views are going to be for incomes of all levels? These will be expensive units that harm the residents around them.</p> <p>Ensure the quality and safety of the built environment; How does this impact residents who have already built and paid to improve Kirkland during their home construction who will now have views blocked by 5 story buildings?</p> <p>Protect and enhance our community's natural resources; Allowing 5 story high density buildings will do nothing but block views and increase traffic in already congested areas. If enacted, the changes will negatively affect thousands of current Kirkland citizens, impacting property values, traffic patterns, view corridors, and livability.</p> <p>The Planning Commission has an obligation to the citizens of Kirkland to fully communicate the expected impact of the zoning changes, and I don't believe the Commission or the City has done this. The outcry you are hearing right now is proof that the communication of the proposed changes has been inadequate. I ask the Planning Commission to slow down, better communicate the options and alternatives, derive more feedback from the citizenry, and place this on a ballot for a vote of the people.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First St. is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the TOT Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in the neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighborhood unique. It would also destroy the value or properties East of Market. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be a reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors. Where will all these future residents park?</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I support relaxing zoning restrictions to allow for high density housing and taller buildings along transit corridors. We need more affordable housing in Kirkland and it is clear that higher density housing - apartments, condos, row houses, etc - are the proven way to achieve this. Allowing more density along existing transit corridors can drives the positive spiral of higher population density supporting more frequent buses that can then attract additional development of higher density housing.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	While I believe that Kirkland and other municipalities need to evolve, the proposed zoning changes around current transit corridors require much more study and public debate. If enacted, the changes will affect thousands of current Kirkland citizens, impacting property values, traffic patterns, view corridors, and livability. The Planning Commission has an obligation to the citizens of Kirkland to fully communicate the expected impact of the zoning changes, and I don't believe the Commission or the City has done this. The outcry you are hearing right now is proof that the communication of the proposed changes has been inadequate. I ask the Planning Commission to slow down, better communicate the options and alternatives, derive more feedback from the citizenry, and not bow to the demands of developers who want a quick buck.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	The Market Street corridor is already a heavily used arterial for residents in the Juanita neighborhood. There is only one lane in each the north and south directions and existing planning documents do not include a widening of the arterial. Indeed, the need for preservation of trees and sidewalks suggests that widening would not be feasible or possible. During afternoon and evening hours, Market Street is regularly congested with stop and go traffic extending from at least 9th Avenue to downtown Juanita. A three- or four-fold increase in the occupancy along the Market Corridor would eventually add hundreds or thousands of additional residents and only increase congestion. In turn, this could result in more motorists using adjacent north-south side streets to by-pass stopped or slow traffic. The side-streets are in residential neighborhoods with young children and inattentive, speeding motorists represent a significant safety concern. Indeed, on several occasions I have observed speeding motorists nearly hit pedestrians (children) coming to/from the Tot Lot on 9th Avenue. Additionally, I and many other families appreciate the existing single-family residential character of our neighborhood. Many of the houses have partial views of Lake Washington that would be obscured by buildings that are higher than 25 feet above the property mid-line. The residents' property values would be significantly adversely affected by the proposed changes. Changes in the maximum occupancy without sufficient on-site parking would result in on-street parking, potentially affecting access by emergency vehicles or residential deliveries such as mail. In addition to safety, the aesthetic character of Kirkland is important to us as residents. The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan do not adequately ensure that such massive mid-rise development will be rejected in the future by building planners.
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I love Kirkland because it has a community feel and is not like a big city with tall buildings. The proposed changes to zoning and parking are really to the extreme, and will kill the character and the family oriented community here. The roads cannot handle the traffic with proposed changes. This has disaster written all over it, our house is close to Market street and my kids walk around the area all the time. The changes will create too much traffic and put the safety of kids and the community at risk. I urge you to reject the proposed changes to Market street rezoning and parking, specifically the changes that allow building higher than 2-3 stories, and allow high density buildings with such minimum parking requirements. Please keep the current zoning. These changes have *disaster* written all over it. Please don't let this happen and change what is great about downtown kirkland!
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	I have lived in Kirkland for over 20 years with my family, raising my two kids here. We love this city and it's community. Kirkland is our home ❤️ I go for a run every morning in Market street. My kids use Market street to go to downtown parks and pools, or to the beaches in the summer. The proposed changes to zoning and parking are really to the extreme, and will kill the character and the family oriented community here. The roads cannot handle the traffic with proposed changes. This has disaster written all over it, my kids and myself will not feel safe to use Market street as we do today because of traffic it bring. It's so unbelievable to assume future resident will just rely on public transit there. I urge you to reject the proposed changes to Market street rezoning and parking, specifically the changes that allow building higher than 2-3 stories, and allows high density buildings with such minimum parking requirement. Please keep the current zoning. These changes have *disaster* written all over it. Please don't ruin our city spirit and character with these changes.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique.</p> <p>I would like to see other changes considered that actually increase home ownership instead of relying on large apartment buildings owned by corporations. For example, this neighborhood is serviced by alleyways, which lend themselves to facilitating DADUs and cottages. To entice SFR owners to increase the number of dwellings, we should consider incentives to make this happen:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ Allow FAR and land use exceptions to enable two- and three-bedroom cottages;</li> <li>2/ Simplify / reduce costs for making these properties condominiums; and</li> <li>3/ In return for allowing these zoning exceptions, we should require DADU/Cottages to be occupied by a household separate from other dwellings on the lot. This would address the issue of property owners creating an ADU/DADU/Cottage to expand their square footage for the same household's use, while at the same time allowing families like mine to provide housing for their adult children.</li> </ol> <p>Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing to register my strong opposition to the changes being proposed to increase zoning density and loosen height restrictions along the Market Street and Lake Washington BLVD transportation corridors.</p> <p>These proposed changes impact single family neighborhoods, block views, increase congestion and are far outside of the scale and scope desired for Kirkland. Furthermore, not providing for adequate parking, pressures the entire surrounding neighborhoods that will become inundated with cars from these developments. Your vision of an urban village of 4-7 story condos and rentals infiltrating formerly single family neighborhoods close to downtown is NOT SHARED by the majority of individuals in Kirkland. Furthermore, your lack of concern for view connections to the lake and olympics shows a blatant disregard for one of the unique elements that have brought so many families and visitors to the city.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Put quite simply, the 108th and 68th corridors can not support the added pressure of the proposed 5 story buildings. These streets cannot be widened for the expansion being considered. Is the city's strategy to make traveling in the area so difficult that we will avoid going to this area?</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Market Street is not just a thoroughfare but a community that I have called home for last 20 years. Its unique blend of small businesses, local charm, and pedestrian-friendly environment are what drew me to live here, and I am deeply concerned that altering these aspects could irreversibly impact our neighborhood's character and livability. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to height limits and density in our neighborhood. Here are the specific reasons for my opposition:</p> <p>Preservation of Neighborhood Character: Increasing height limits risks altering the skyline and aesthetic appeal of Market Street. It is crucial to maintain the current scale that contributes to our neighborhood's charm and identity.</p> <p>Traffic and Parking: Higher density developments often lead to increased traffic congestion and parking challenges. As someone who navigates these streets daily, I am concerned about how these changes will affect our ability to move freely and safely.</p> <p>Community Engagement: I believe that meaningful community engagement is essential in shaping the future of our neighborhood. Residents like myself should have a voice and be actively involved in decisions that impact our community's future.</p> <p>In conclusion, I respectfully urge you to reconsider the proposed changes to height limits and density on Market Street. As a resident who opposes these changes, I hope that you will prioritize preserving the character and livability of our neighborhood while planning for its future growth.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First Street is an integral part of the community - it is where everyone comes to walk for far-reaching lake views and to enjoy the Tot Lot and views from this park. I have lived on First street for over 15 years and it is a residential community and NOT meant for large scale development. Increasing the building height and density allowed in this neighborhood, as well as extending mixed-use buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique and destroy current residents community and property values.</p> <p>I would like to see other changes considered that actually increase home ownership instead of relying on large apartment buildings owned by corporations. For example, this neighborhood is serviced by alleyways, which lend themselves to facilitating DADUs and cottages. To entice SFR owners to increase the number of dwellings, we should consider incentives to make this happen:</p> <p>Allow FAR and land use exceptions to enable two- and three-bedroom cottages; Simplify / reduce costs for making these cottage properties condominiums/subdividable; and</p> <p>In return for allowing these zoning exceptions, we should require DADU/Cottages to be occupied by a household separate from other dwellings on the lot. This would address the issue of property owners creating a DADU/Cottage to expand their square footage for the same household's use, while at the same time allowing families like mine to provide housing for their adult children.</p> <p>Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. There is no evidence yet that there will be reliable and frequent enough bus service that would entice future residents to give up cars. We should not allow this irresponsible building prior to changes in both Sound Transit funding and demonstration of changes in residents' transit behaviors.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I suggest two alternative approaches to the proposed density changes along Market Street Transit Corridor</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Tiered Density: Change the zoning for properties adjacent to frequent transit corridors to allow for high-density development with elevated height restrictions. This would create a gradual transition zone, with density decreasing as you move away from the corridor. This model is actually reflected in the density examples cited in the presentation.</li> </ol> <p>OR</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>2. Retain Current Zoning: Maintain the existing 12-units/acre zoning and Policy MS-8, which limits building heights to 2-3 stories in the Mark Street Corridor.</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I live in the Norkirk Neighborhood for almost 15 years with my wife and three young kids. We have seen how growth has changed Kirkland over the years, and am especially worried about traffic safety with our kids. There are frequent accidents on 1st street and 7th Ave, and many folks race up 1st street to avoid bottlenecks on 405 and market street. It is becoming less safe with the volume of folks in this corridor. We don't have the parking to handle more capacity of people as well.</p> <p>In connection with the Comprehensive Plan update, I urge you to reconsider proposed density increases in neighborhoods that already have infrastructure and traffic safety challenges. I am against the proposed Transit Corridors and accompanying density increases.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We assume as you are our trusted and elected City Council, you will keep our community in the best interest. We are writing to express our complete disapproval of the ridiculous 2044 Comprehensive Plan. It truly would destroy the fabric of our community. Please stop this plan.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Increase density; existing zoning is not sufficient- A Bridle Trails single-family home owner, for over 25 years I believe that Kirkland, should have much more density, especially in my neighborhood, to preserve the outlying rural environments that are being pushed into developing into more suburban areas to absorb the population needs. More density is an absolute requirement in controlling housing cost. More density is better overall for the environment. We have had a very wonderful situation here for many years, where we are close and have easy access to the city amenities, and yet have a lush tree canopy, plentiful green space, and expansive infrastructure based on car-travel. We have had more than our fair share and have borne less than our fair share of the cost</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>While I believe that Kirkland and other municipalities need to evolve, the proposed zoning changes around current transit corridors require much more study and public debate.</p> <p>If enacted, the changes will affect thousands of current Kirkland citizens, impacting property values, traffic patterns, view corridors, and livability.</p> <p>The Planning Commission has an obligation to the citizens of Kirkland to fully communicate the expected impact of the zoning changes, and I don't believe the Commission or the City has done this. The outcry you are hearing right now is proof that the communication of the proposed changes has been inadequate.</p> <p>I ask the Planning Commission to slow down, better communicate the options and alternatives, derive more feedback from the citizenry, and not bow to the</p>
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I want to understand why the Michael's and Goodwill sites can't be redeveloped at their current zone densities. Why create such a bottleneck at two highly dense arteries and add to an already huge transportation problem. People will not be taking the bus - it's impractical for many. I'm an itinerant teacher for the North Shore School District and I have to drive to work. I implore the Council to hear residents. We moved here because we did not want to live in Bellevue or Seattle.</p>
7/10/2024	Land use Changes	<p>Opposes land use change submitted with the Par Mac community-initiated amendment request because there will not be enough population to support such a request, poor infrastructure, negative impact on neighborhood, and insufficient information at the City to support approval.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes	Juanita resident opposed to land use changes
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes	Houghton resident that is very upset by the proposed density changes to the Comprehensive Plan. I am against the proposed transit corridors and their density increases. This will not improve Kirkland. It is not the desire of the community. We do not want to become Seattle. It is inappropriate to allow this kind of density in quiet, low-rise residential neighborhoods. Allow it in downtown or Totem Lake or on 85th. It would be irresponsible to implement any density changes without making improvements to our infrastructure first.
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to large apartments like the proposed Par Mac community-initiated amendment request do to impacts on home values.
7/3/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I wanted to take a moment to respond to some of the things I heard tonight during Items from the Audience. This email comes to you in four parts.</p> <p>Part 1: The Bulldozers Are Not Coming Tomorrow I often hear people treating the changes proposed for the comprehensive plan as if they will instantly materialize the moment the vote is passed. But we know that isn't true. In the words of former Fayetteville, AR city councilmember Matthew Petty: "I think it's going to happen a lot slower than people want it to happen, and a lot slower than people who fear the change expect it to happen." But we're making a plan for the next 20 years. So of course there will be some things that would be jarring if they were to happen overnight. I think it could be useful to remind people of the time scale of this plan. What did Kirkland look like 20 years ago? (Honest question, I've only been here 15).</p> <p>Part 2: Cities Grow. One of the recurring themes I hear from people opposed to new housing is that they "moved to Kirkland for _____". That blank could be a "small town feel", it could be "low density", it could be anything. I literally had someone tell me they moved to Kirkland because they liked all the farmland. But cities change. Kirkland has been changing for the almost 120 years since its founding. It was changing long before that. It will change long after we are gone. Peter Kirk moved here for the nearby coal deposits. Japanese-Americans moved here to grow strawberries. Workers moved here for the shipbuilding jobs. Native Americans moved here before recorded history. Why is now somehow the "correct" state of the city that has to be frozen in amber? Manhattan was once farmland. Cities grow, it's what they do (when things are going well). If someone chose to move to Kirkland because it was a particular size/density/intensity and they expected it to always stay that way, well, I'm sorry? That is a ridiculous thing to expect.</p> <p>Part 3: Supply and Demand. Over and over and over, I hear the argument "we built new housing and it was expensive, so building housing doesn't increase affordability." This argument is naive at best and disingenuous at worst. Building new housing (yes, even luxury housing) exerts downward pressure on home prices. But it exerts that pressure across the whole market. Just like not building housing makes all the housing more expensive, building housing makes all the housing less expensive. In what world did someone honestly expect the brand new home to be the affordable one? Building that brand new home relieves upward price pressure on existing housing stock by giving someone who would bid up the price somewhere else to bid. This argument is so fallacious it feels like a deliberate attempt to mislead. We should reject it out of hand.</p> <p>Part 4: Kirkland Is More Than Short Buildings. Someone tonight worried aloud at the lectern that if we built those slightly-larger-than-what-is-already-there apartments near transit, that Kirkland would be ruined, and the charm gone. I, for one, think Kirkland is more than the height of its buildings. Kirkland is its people, its history, its geography, its businesses, and its spirit. If someone thinks that building some apartments and welcoming more people into our city is going to undo all those amazing things, then they must not think much of Kirkland to begin with.</p> <p>Thank you for being the steady hand on the tiller, and thank you for making the right decisions for Kirkland's future. The ones that people will look back on and say "I'm so glad the council was forward thinking back in 2024". P.S. I think Totem Lake is awesome, I don't know what that was all about - it went from a mostly dead, sad strip mall to one of the most vibrant and bustling parts of the city!</p>
7/1/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Now is the time to be bold in studying the density of housing near transit. Please don't limit the study of density near transit to 100 du/acre. We should study up to 200 du/acre to make it possible to fit economical mid-rise construction where needed-- without the need to do an additional EIS in the future. Please allow future transit stops to support affordable housing densities. Affordable rental housing is typically only possible at a certain scale of development due to economies of scale. The density of these developments is usually mid-rise construction between 100 and 200 du/acre. Don't study this density in a way that would trade off with density allocations in other parts of the city. Remember: The DSEIS is a chance for the city to explore what is possible, and so it should have a bold vision. Remember that the City of Kirkland has undershot growth in the previous growth period, only achieving around 75% of the last growth target. The city should be bolder this time around.</p>
6/29/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Just want to express how adding more than 200-300ish housing units and a 75 foot high building crammed into the extended Goodwill site would utterly bastardize the character of our neighborhood. I have no problem with adding some more housing to that corner (more retail is great and it should somewhat connect with the existing retail if possible), but any housing needs to have its own parking and at least somewhat fit into the area. If you can't find a builder who could make a 200-300 + retail project work, I would be stunned. A large 75ft tall building would be like putting the mound from Close Encounters of the Third Kind into Juanita. When I asked about that site being a candidate for the proposed aquatic center, even before the Fire Station made the site smaller, I was told the site "was too small", well, it's smaller now. Please only allow something reasonable to be approved. And codify a reasonable rezone to the area. We all know if 75ft. is put in the code, 75ft. buildings are coming. Please rethink that.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
6/27/2024	Land Use Changes	Support increase housing density 200 du/acre along transit corridors
6/27/2024	Land Use Changes	Support increase housing density 200 du/acre along transit corridors
6/26/2024	Land Use Changes	Eastside Housing Roundtable Steering Committee submitted comments - see comment letter for full comments. [staff summary] By studying densities up to 200 du/acre along transit lines, the city will be better positioned to generate and sustain strong transit ridership. Additionally, capacity is not the same as a target. Kirkland should be zoning with the understanding that actual housing production will be less than the zoning envelope due to market and other factors.
6/26/2024	Land Use Changes	Be bold- increase housing density greater than 100 dwelling units per acre near transit. We should study up to 200 du/acre without the need to do an additional EIS in the future.
6/20/2024	Land Use Changes	At the Michael's development location, salmon are impacted, but also eagles are blinded by shiny windows at sunset, herons can't navigate high buildings, shy beavers will not have as much opportunity to get their proper nutrition with the crowding, waterfowl will lose nesting areas. I want to defend the animals, the water
6/17/2024	Land Use Changes	Whenever development occurs near wildlife locations, there needs to be a buffer zone so that the wildlife feels safe. Turtles, and other aquatic, marine, and land wildlife do not feel safe next to developments. Often, people will want to build next to wildlife areas so that they can view such wildlife, but the the wildlife will usually suffer as a result. Often, even, the residents will complain when the wildlife "invades their space" and want to eliminate it. There are plenty of areas for building that have a much lower impact on the wildlife than the one chosen here. Please discard this plan.
6/13/2024	Land Use Changes	Support for growth alternative
6/11/2024	Land Use Changes	Housing should not be considered in the Michaels and Goodwill locations, let alone high density.
6/8/2024	Land Use Changes	I have concerns regarding the proposed Michaels zoning amendments. for as long as I can remember, people have been complaining about mass transit. While having a walkable neighborhood is definitely a positive thing, forcing reliance on walking, or unreliable transit, is not so good. This is especially true as a population ages and becomes not so mobile, or as myself, are restricted to a wheelchair. Reduced mobility without the alternative of private transportation results in reliance on deliveries and/or very nearby stores. For the proposed Michael's site, very nearby food means expensive restaurants/fast-food or expensive convenience stores, dramatically increasing the cost of living.
6/8/2024	Land Use Changes	I would love to see Juanita transform into a high-activity, easily accessible and pedestrian-centric area. We really need more density and more (more!) housing across the entire county and Kirkland is no exception as there is quite a bit of sprawl. I think the Michael's redevelopment is a fantastic project and a great idea to get us closer to this dream.
6/5/2024	Land Use Changes	These areas are not appropriate for more density. Goodwill has nearby schools that would be affected by more crowding and traffic. Michaels is one of the most beautiful nature reserves. Please don't let high density ruin it for the animals and people. I am asking, begging you to not let this foolish decision be made.
6/4/2024	Land Use Changes	In regards to the plan to add housing instead of the Michaels store / Kathakali restaurant in Kirkland / Juanita I do object to the development plan. This is a park area and would happen on sensitive wetlands. I am living since 2007 in Kirkland, and already now traffic is just madness at the intersection of 100th and Juanita drive. There is no available parking. And the area is already congested and dangerous to bicycle riders and pedestrians. Based on the location this intersection
6/2/2024	Land Use Changes	We are against the proposal to remove the existing Michaels building to erect an extremely oversized building at an intersection that is already overtaxed. Please examine your motives for this building of housing that destroys the character and livability of a city that the existing residents like as is. If we wanted to live in an overbuilt, sterile city where residents are warehoused in clone like housing, we would move to Bellevue or Redmond. Keep Kirkland KIRKLAND!
5/30/2024	Land Use Changes	Regarding the upcoming redevelopment of the Micheal's store property, we support apartments/condos on the lot, but not the waiver of the height restrictions. Seven stories are too high for this neighborhood. Juanita Village, across the street is four stories and a comfortable "feel" for the area.
5/28/2024	Land Use Changes	I strongly oppose the proposed high rise developments at the current Goodwill and Michael's store. Traffic in those areas is already extremely congested at certain times a day. Juanita Drive is the only access point to all of Hermosa Vista, Champagne/Holmes Pt/Goat Hill areas. It is sometimes near impossible to make a left hand turn from Hermosa Vista and all of the new development in the Totem Lake are will add to that congestion.
5/28/2024	Land Use Changes	Do not rezone the Micheal's/Good Will Parcels to allow building the massive developments proposed.
5/27/2024	Land Use Changes	I am deeply concerned about the proposed housing development at the current Michaels location in Juanita. The impact of such an increase in housing will not only increase traffic density, decrease pedestrian and biker safety, but will also negatively impact the charm and beauty of the Juanita area at issue and
5/27/2024	Land Use Changes	We absolutely oppose this idea! As a resident of Finn Hill for over 50 years, it's clear that nobody at the top of the neighborhood wants this project. Adding a 7-story building would only worsen the already significant traffic issues

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/27/2024	Land Use Changes	I am opposed to the two proposed redevelopments, one at the Michael's location and the other at the Goodwill location. Both should be redesigned to meet current zoning codes. Please keep the height requirements at the current limit of 35 feet and 200-250 units. Please make sure the designs at both sites are welcoming, like Juanita Village. Please do not allow changes to City zoning to be dictated by developers.
5/26/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed housing to be built on the locations of the Michaels crafts store and Goodwill are going to have serious impacts to the commute and general driving at both intersections. Keeping both projects within scale that prevents further degradation of both pedestrians and vehicle traffic would be better for all users of the area including those who reside on Finn Hill. There is a true need to provide better and more comprehensive transit service which has been degraded over the last 5 - 10 yrs. The Goodwill housing proposal is massively bigger than current zoning allows. One hopes that the project stays within current zoning and does not become the overwhelmingly massive project that Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance provided information on! Lack of communication to the local neighborhoods is also problematic and hopefully will be remedied by appropriate mailings to local residences that will be significantly impacted by these 2 large projects that will have very significant impact on travel both during peak and off peak times and also increase the overall need for various other public services. Housing is outrageously expensive whether renting or buying and never seems to be reduced in cost simply by adding huge projects because of how the real estate markets have become big investor businesses that are not interested in providing affordable pricing but rather corporate profits. Thank you for reading and I, for one, look forward to eventually moving to a place that does not consider growth at all costs as the only way to sustainable local economy.
5/25/2024	Land Use Changes	The request for 800 units on the Goodwill site is wildly disproportionate, but it is a good site for redevelopment. I would approve a 50% increase from the current zoning, and approve the retail. The Michael's site is more difficult. Connecting the parks is a long term quality of life benefit for all residents. Access by car is currently a problem, and will be worse with the housing proposed. I would like to see the City purchase that property with a long term plan to unite the parks. It would be a great community center for all ages. More housing is not the answer for that site.
5/25/2024	Land Use Changes	The sites of the Goodwill and Michaels proposals are on bus lines and major traffic streets, which are appropriate. Assuming car parking for residents will be underground, this will help manage the additional number of cars. Both sites would not involve major tree-removal, which is happening at an alarming rate. Our quality of life depends on our natural green spaces, we must remember this and work to preserve them. Will customer parking for the retail businesses be above ground? The Michaels site is adjacent to waterfront and popular walking, dog-walking trails and beaches. A 7 story high-rise buliding that blocks light and views, and introduces more car traffic that crosses sidewalks and trails would alter the character and safety of this important recreational area. Why has the number of Goodwill site units tripled, besides the moneymaking opportunity? The height of this building then becomes incompatible with surrounding buildings, changing the character of the neighborhood (schools and playground, small restaurants and shops, small retail businesses, smallll church). We need affordable housing, will these proposals include lower-cost units for qualifying residents?
5/25/2024	Land Use Changes	Regarding the proposed Goodwill development rezoning of 600 unit building from the current 200 unit building - I'm very concerned that this area and infrastructure cannot accommodate 600 units. The amount of cars and traffic will make an already heavily congested area even worse in Juanita. This cannot be allowed to happen. Common sense housing increases should be the only plan.
5/24/2024	Land Use Changes	While I support the need for additional housing, I'd like to understand how these units would be "affordable" given the excessive inflation of residential rental rates. What consideration for supporting infrastructure is part of the evaluation? The schools appear to be at capacity and any new housing will necessitate accommodation of families.
5/24/2024	Land Use Changes	I have concerns about the intensity of both projects. We already have traffic problems especially on 132nd and Juanita Drive being a primary routes on and off Finn Hill, There is a relative lack of transit around the Goodwill site. I feel that the City has NOT effectively gotten word out about either project to the community. I would encourage more consideration in regard to growth in the Kirkland area.
5/24/2024	Land Use Changes	I am FOR the proposal at both Goodwill and Michael's. I'm sure there has been plenty of negative feedback but I wanted to assure you that not everyone is responding negatively as I am excited for the changes coming to Kirkland.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	Honestly I'm for multi use business to belting some additional commerce to the area, small housing with multi zoning could work if building was less than 50 units. 50 units alone would add 100+ cars not to mention the traffic for the commercial buildings. Please think through more deeply. There has to be a balance in community planning.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I have concerns about the intensity of both projects. We already have traffic problems especially on 132nd and Juanita Drive being a primary routes on and off Finn Hill, There is a relative lack of transit around the Goodwill site. I feel that the City has NOT effectively gotten word out about either project to the community. I would encourage more consideration in regard to growth in the Kirkland area.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I live in Juanita and do not support increasing the number of housing units on the GoodWill site from 200 to 600. Traffic is already horrible in that area. I take my son to swim lesson at the high school during rush hour and have to allot 20 minutes to go less than 2 miles, it feels like I'm living in LA again.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I completely disagree with the proposal for the large apartment complex at the Goodwill site. It would change the entire make up of that space and isn't one that the neighborhood supports!

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	Why is it necessary to built units over our already planned zoning regulations? Are these buildings going to be affordable for our firemen , teachers or people who work in the businesses in our neighborhood? How are we to handle crowded roads the extra burden on our water and electricity etc. i moved to kirkland for the smaller town feel. We do not need to overbuild like redmond and Bellevue.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	As a resident of Finn Hill, I am concerned that the city has not done enough infrastructure improvements to warrant adding so many new housing units. I am not in favor of increasing population density without first improving infrastructure.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed expansion for the Goodwill property at 132nd and 100th is far too ambitious for our neighborhood. The impacts to roads, school safety, traffic would negatively impact the overall quality of life for area residents. The proposed size is too massive for that area. There is nothing equal in size anywhere in our neighborhood. I would love to see the property redeveloped. I've lived up the hill for 24 years and the lot is an eyesore. While 250 units is acceptable, 600 units is a massive overreach and doesn't fit in this neighborhood. Please do not allow the increase.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	Strongly oppose the Michael's rezone proposal. The site has environmental constraints and the scale proposed is out of proportion with the size of the zone.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I've been working with the Juanita Community Plan Update Working Group, and so I've been considering the ramifications of both the Goodwill and Michael's site proposals since November 2023. In all of that time, I have not come up with a single reason why these proposals wouldn't improve the Juanita community.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	My primary concerns about the Michael's proposal are the increased height and potential building bulk that will loom over the nearby intersection of Juanita Dr/98th Ave NE and the negative environmental effects on the nearby lake and wetlands.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I recognize that Kirkland needs more housing, but proposals to allow buildings up to 70 or 75 feet high at the Goodwill and Michael's sites would simply too much for those locations.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	BRFII KIRKLAND LLC ("Balboa") writes in support of the staff recommendations related to 9826 NE 132nd Street, commonly known as the Goodwill Site.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I want to express my concerns and out right rejection to this development project of 300 units on the property. There is not enough space or distance away from the busy intersection for all the traffic that will be coming and going from the apartment complex.The best use of this area for the community would be to develop it into a park / open space. Adding more congestion is not going to help make this area more livable. It will have Just the opposite affect.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a 10+ year resident of Juanita and I am not opposed to growth. However, growth must be managed and not simply mitigated with conditions. My major concern with the rezone of the Michael's site is the tremendous impacts upon traffic that can be anticipated from such a density increase.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	RE: Michaels - I am very much opposed to this project. I believe that the development as planned, its scope and size, are totally inappropriate for this location. I am very concerned about its impacts on the surrounding neighborhood and the additional traffic it would generate. Please reject this proposal.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	We are strongly opposed to the plan to develop the Goodwill land across from Juanita Elementary into a 7 story complex with retail shops below. We have lived on Finn Hill for 30+ years. I taught at Juanita El. for 20 years. The neighborhood cannot support the influx of that many people, cars, and overall traffic! The impact on Juanita El, Finn Hill Middle School and Juanita High would be horrific to the LWSD School District. Not enough classroom space, and teachers, as well as the school bus system. Roads are already congested. Traffic is diverting up the road to Finn Hill to access Juanita Drive. Last Friday afternoon, it was backed up from the top of Finn Hill (the Albertsons Hill—now known to some as Goodwill Hill) down to Juanita El. The impact on traffic, schools, and retail services would be devastating. Those of us who have lived in this area for years have appreciated the quality of life here; the parks, great schools, and community feeling. Kirkland is changing and in our opinion, not in a positive direction. Please consider the voices and opinions of those of us who've been supporting the City of Kirkland with our taxes and community contributions for many years.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	I'm concerned about the scale of the planned development at the Goodwill site on 100th. This area is extremely prone to traffic congestion already and is a major arterial for Finn Hill residents. It seems like an appropriate place for development but on a smaller scale.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>For the Juanita area, the development proposed on the goodwill site (7-stories) is taller than Totem Lake (6-stories). This does not fit the character of the area at all!! Also, traffic is worse along 100th than in totem lake. The residents that will suffer most are not Juanita residents, but those on Finn Hill that have to pass through Juanita to get to the freeways. Finn Hill neighborhood does not have adequate infrastructure to get on/off the hill during peak times and feeds through the Juanita area. Adding congestion in Juanita will add a further bottleneck to areas that need to pass through.</p> <p>Jumping from 1-story to 7 is too much! Build the infrastructure (roads) and get the bus service first, then allow density that it supports. And not just transit along 100th. How are commuters on the hill getting to the park and rides? Why isn't there a predictable loop bus to/from the Totem Lake freeway stop and Kingsgate and loops Finn Hill to collect and deposit riders? The on-demand Metro Flex isn't reliable enough when you have someplace you have to be. You can't guarantee you'll get where you need to go (and yes, our family uses it)...</p> <p>Too much growth without the infrastructure and forethought is not a benefit to the community. Build what the infrastructure can handle, not the other way around.</p>
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Goodwill site: 600+ units of residential, 15,000 s.f. commercial space, 7 stories tall (proposed by the site owner). Screw Kirkland, this will incinerate Juanita/Kenmore. The traffic infrastructure in the area will not sustain the growth of 600 apartments, retail and commercial building. 7 stories tall ! Are you freaking kidding me? Kirkland doesn't care as it's on the boarder of Kenmore and Kirkland citizens will not be effected but Kenmore will be decimated.</p>
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Regarding the comprehensive plan for the Goodwill site on 132nd St. We have lived on Finn Hill for 34 years. Growth is needed and inevitable but when it starts to degrade our standard of living and mobility we must, as a community, voice our concerns. My wife and I are in strong opposition to the 600+ units proposed for the Goodwill site. This intersection is already maxed out for traffic. Such a huge structure does not blend with the surrounding homes and businesses. I can't imagine Juanita Elementary is too happy with this project. Please consider something in the 200 unit range.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing about the proposal to build housing at the Michael's location. While I understand the need for more housing, I don't think that is a good location. First of all, that is a busy intersection. It's hard to get in and out of the Michael's store. I can't imagine putting a huge apartment complex there. Second, if they did build housing there, could the city help Michaels find a new location? It would be a shame to lose them. There are no other close craft stores.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I encourage you to reject the proposed increase in height limitation for the Goodwill site. I support the redevelopment of the site into a vibrant commercial and residential area of the neighborhood center - at the current zoning and height limit.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a homeowner in the Finn Hill neighborhood and recently learned about the proposed developments at the Goodwill and Michaels sites. In disagreement with the sentiments of the FNHA board, I believe the development should go forward as proposed. I believe the Finn Hill community would be better served by advocating for increased bus and transit service in the Finn Hill neighborhood. We cannot be NIMBY complainers while our region faces a housing crisis of monumental scope. I look forward to welcoming future neighbors to our wonderful Finn Hill community.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'd like to voice my enthusiastic approval for redeveloping the Juanita Goodwill location - but with an important caveat. The zoning is currently for 250 residential units. Given the size of the corridor and the adjacent school, this seems appropriate and (more importantly) safe. It won't significantly impact the use of 132nd for the residents of Finn Hill getting into and out of the neighborhood). The proposal of 600 units is too big. It would be too large for 132nd and 100th, cause entirely too much traffic and safety issues for bikes and pedestrians and significantly alter the neighborhood.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Goodwill site: Expressing concerns. I do not believe the area infrastructure could support the zoning increase to allow for 600 units. I have similar concerns about the proposed development at the current Michaels site. In particular, the increase in traffic at an already congested intersection.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The proposal for the Goodwill space is way too big for the location. 600 units! Right now there are issues with the traffic at that corner. Public transit exists but looking at the buses, they are usually totally empty. One does not see many people at bus stops throughout the day. The city thinking people living here will ride transit or bikes are not looking at reality.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Please do not approve these changes in zoning at Michaels and Goodwill. Growth is inevitable, but, to maintain the character of our neighborhood, it should proceed wisely.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am so disgusted with how a wonderful city like Kirkland has been changed into a high rise and traffic nightmare. We are being choked to death. Do not add more high rise buildings!</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Keep Kirkland in scale with a livable, walkable city where sunshine falls on everyone. Don't change the zoning code to allow for buildings 6-7 stories tall at the Goodwill site.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a junior in highschool and a member of the Kirkland community. I would like to continue to live in this area near my family and friends. This is currently not possible for me. There is a deficit of housing that we need to fill. Please build more housing on the Michael's and Goodwill lots. Please also build plentiful housing in all parts of Kirkland, especially near transit, including these lots.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I would like to see the existing density restrictions and number of unit restrictions for both areas remain. I do not believe it is in the best interest of the city of Kirkland to change these; affecting the environment, the traffic, the schools, and the aesthetic feeling of Kirkland.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I've been informed that there is a proposal for a massive development, far exceeding the earlier planned 200 - 250 residential units at the NE 132nd St. Goodwill site. The proposal for 600 residential units will be a monstrosity in the neighbourhood, strongly affecting traffic along one of the few major access roads to Finn Hill. My concern with the redevelopment of the Michael's site with a seven story residential project on Juanita Drive is the effect on traffic at the intersection of Juanita Drive/NE 116th Ave and 98th Ave NE
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I don't want to lose the relaxed feeling of the neighborhood, which is reinforced by trees, green spaces, buildings with human scale proportions. So, in planning mixed housing/retail spaces, density must be balanced with maintaining a livable neighborhood. Buildings that are terraced, with fewer (2-3) floors by the street have a more relaxed ambience, blend better into public spaces.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	The development of the Goodwill site is particularly concerning as modification of traffic lanes to accommodate the load of up to 1200 vehicles is worrisome (2 per unit). Especially the zoning is changed. If it's relevant, I support these sites for low income housing. However, unless transit and the traffic infrastructure are properly matched, this portends to be a problem.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed project for 600 residential units and ±15,000 sf of retail space at the Goodwill site (next to the fire station and across from Juanita Elementary School, on NE 132nd Street) - versus the 200-250 units that current zoning allows is totally unacceptable.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I think for the goodwill site, the builder should be allowed to build the 250 or so unit currently allowed ("by right") without undue obstruction, but that a 600 unit apartment is "too much" (I have misgivings about 250 but current zoning is current zoning.) It's already a traffic problem. Across from a school. AND That large number of apartments suggests that very few to none of them will be the 2 bedroom or 3 bedroom units that families want.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am asking you and the city council to reject the request to put a seven story apartment/retail building on the corner of 98th and Juanita Drive. I'm not sure if you have done a traffic study in this busy corridor, but I can tell you that adding an additional 300 apartment units will cause extreme duress to the environment as well as the traffic. Please, please reject this request. It will not improve our area, it will destroy the beauty of the sanctuary.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance is deeply concerned that these upzoning proposals are inappropriate in terms of their impact on traffic and the character of the neighborhood. FHNA believes that the upzoning proposals should be more carefully analyzed and exposed to public comment than has occurred in connection with the current Comprehensive Plan update.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I wish to voice my opposition to the JP16 policy recommendation that is part of the Juanita Neighborhood plan revision. The Michaels site should not go forward for multi-story residential development.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	It is fine that the property will be redeveloped. It is an opportunity to improve the use of what is already a built environment. It is a good site for housing density and retail. I understand the region's need for affordable housing and this is a good place to add well-designed, enjoyable homes for those who need an affordable price point. The scope of the project is at issue. Concerns about scale, unit count, height in relation to surrounding single family development, emergency vehicle deployment nearby.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am against your proposal to have a 7 story building on the corner where Michaels is located. and the Goodwill site. The traffic around here is terrible. Traffic is here to stay and you need to make the infrastructure support it. Planning on all this housing in Juanita is just plain crazy. Putting in this many units here is wrong. We can barely support what we have.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed apartment/condo buildings that want to go into the property where the Goodwill and the Michael's stores are a terrible idea. The roads around both places and all of Juanita and Totem Lake are already so crowded now.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I want no more high rises filling up every available space. The city has also reduced the minimum lot size for dwellings and encourages three story houses and condos which of course mean more revenue. Nothing should be done without a vote of the people. WE PAY THE TAXES. I don't want to lose either Michaels or Goodwill as I frequent both. We have to stop this madness.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	Strongly disagree with increasing proposed units by 3x. No benefit for the actual community- who benefits is the developers making more money. Are there kickbacks for city council? What is going on? Also, lack of transparency and feeling like these developments are being rammed through without appropriate community support.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I'm not sure if these comments will actually be taken into account or if this is just here to make the residents of this town feel like they are being heard.... The city needs a better plan for the Goodwill and Michael's developments. Those two intersections are already crazy enough and as it is, getting off Finn Hill in the am is getting more and more frustrating. The residents' voices are seldom heard over the developers and their fistful of dollars. Please, no high density projects.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I don't want 100th Ave NE in Juanita to become the new Lake City Way of Kirkland. A vertical housing canyon of concrete to the street. I don't want to lose the relaxed feeling of the neighborhood, which is reinforced by trees, green spaces, buildings with human scale proportions. So, in planning mixed housing/retail spaces, density must be balanced with maintaining a livable neighborhood. Buildings that are terraced, with fewer (2-3) floors by the street have a more relaxed ambience, blend better into public spaces. How will building heights impact the views of neighbors uphill? If they have to look at roofs, they should be attractive, not an eyesore. As little lake view as possible should be blocked. Can Green Roofs and Green Walls be required? Both intensive and extensive. These could reduce pollution, manage water run-off, provide habitat for birds and pollinators, reduce the heat island effect. It might mitigate some of the loss of a view by substituting a comparably beautiful view. Perhaps there are federal or state funding sources to offset the initial cost of these. Similarly, can bioswales be incorporated into landscaping by the streets? How will this planned density effect small businesses in the area? Will Goodwill and Michaels be able to relocate within our area? Will there be affordable retail and commercial spaces available in the future? Both sites are located at major intersections, that already get congested at commute times and with elementary school traffic. How do you propose to manage some 600-1000 more vehicles per day at these intersections? Will any expanded bus service include Finn Hill? If not, will there be a strategically located park and ride?</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am concerned about the modifications of zoning proposed for the up coming plan for Kirkland. While Kirkland has a responsibility to absorb growth of the region proportionately, planners also have a responsibility to maintain the quality of life that drove us to chose Kirkland as our home. Two items are glaring exceptions to reasonable growth: 1) The increase of the Michael's zoning to a 7 story building. Not only will it disrupt traffic, challenge infrastructure but it will also block views of the water, city, mountains that give such joy to living in the area. 2) the increase in zoned for the Goodwill site from 250 to 600 units. There is no mention of transition, schools, sewer, parks, electricity and road usage. 132nd and 100th is a nasty intersection several hours at each end of the day, so more than doubling the zoned number of residences is outrageous. Please retain the zoning as is, both areas have old buildings that need change more than doubling residences is not sensible and a real insult to those of us who have loved to live here.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The seven story building being proposed at the Michaels Juanita Drive will destroy the skyline. We won't be able to see the skyline. Such a building wil have lasting impact on the wet lands and on Juanita Beach and Park. The Traffic will be even more frustrating. If a new building really is necessary why can't our city council require the the building be fresh and with creative design?</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My concern about the proposed Michael's site is the very heavy commute traffic past that location on Juanita Drive. I'm wondering how people will enter and exit the structure without significantly slowing the rush hour traffic. My concern about the proposed Goodwill site is the immensity of it. And I understand there isn't good transit closeby. This will definitely very negatively impact the entrance and exit to Finn Hill.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Not inclined on the new building construction at the Goodwill site until better plan for traffic management, scaling of transportation resources, roads, parking. This will choke the NE 132nd St uphill and downhill which is the main route to Finn Hill neighborhood.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The proposal for 600 apartments/mixed use facility at the site of the current Goodwill in north Juanita is ridiculous. Traffic is already a nightmare in that area. More apartments will only make it worse.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'd like to voice my enthusiastic approval for redeveloping the Juanita Goodwill location - but with an important caveat. The zoning is currently for 250 residential units. Given the size of the corridor and the adjacent school, this seems appropriate and (more importantly) safe. It won't significantly impact the use of 132nd for the residents of Finn Hill getting into and out of the neighborhood).The proposal of 600 units is too big. It would be too large for 132nd and 100th, cause entirely too much traffic and safety issues for bikes and pedestrians and significantly alter the neighborhood.I do think this site needs redevelopment. And the area needs more housing. But increasing the zoning by more than double seems foolhardy.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The proposed building of 600 units on the Goodwill site should be limited to the number of units that are zoned now. The area cannot handle 600 units plus all of the cars. Traffic on 132 street is already overloaded and will probably get worse as drivers use the new exits from 405. Building large developments should not be started until road improvement and widening has been completed.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I would like to express my concerns about the proposed development at the current Goodwill location on NE 132nd Street. I do not believe the area infrastructure could support the zoning increase to allow for 600 units. The increase in traffic on a major arterial and the increased pressure on schools, parks, police, fire, and other local services would be devastating for the entire area. In addition, the area is not well served by mass transit currently, leaving the new development's residents dependent on cars. I am aware that Kirkland needs more housing and would support building housing at the Goodwill location consistent with its current zoning of 200 units. I have similar concerns about the proposed development at the current Michaels site. In particular, the increase in traffic at an already congested intersection. In short, I urge the city to leave zoning as it currently is.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Juanita Neighborhood Plan Update includes two CAR proposals, one for Michael's site and one for the Goodwill site. Below is my comment letter sent to the Planning Commission regarding the Goodwill site - to keep the existing zoning intact and keep the existing building height limit to 35 feet.</p> <p>Subject: Juanita Neighborhood Plan Update – Goodwill Site and Michael's Site development</p> <p>I am a Kirkland resident of the Finn Hill neighborhood and I use the Juanita Neighborhood arterials and the North Juanita Neighborhood Center daily. Juanita and Finn Hill residents rely on the same network of streets and the same community commercial district. I encourage you, Commissioners and the City planners to extend project outreach into the adjacent and interdependent neighborhoods. I regret learning belatedly about development proposals for the Goodwill and Michael's sites within Juanita Neighborhood and I appreciate the opportunity to provide input to the Juanita Neighborhood Plan Update.</p> <p>I support the redevelopment of the North Juanita Neighborhood Center to include additional retail and commercial businesses as well as to increase housing within the neighborhood within the current zoning and height limits. Development to the existing allowed height limit of 35' would represent a significant increase in housing units and commercial space on site – which would be a good thing for the neighborhood center and for both the Juanita and Finn Hill neighborhoods. This development could be comparable to the existing mixed use and multifamily housing development in Juanita Village where circulation and access has been well designed as a walkable neighborhood center at a human scale.</p> <p>I do not support an increase in allowed height for the development on the Goodwill site – it would be completely out of scale for the neighborhood center and could be a cause for additional traffic congestion along 100th Avenue NE and NE 132nd Street. Keep the current zoning and height limit at 35 feet for the Goodwill site property and encourage a thoughtful redevelopment that will add desired housing and commercial/retail uses on site.</p> <p>The community initiated amendment request (CAR) for the Goodwill site includes a request for more than double the building height limit for the site. This would result in too much density for the site, not allowing for any stepped back style of buildings nor allowing the space required for the on-site circulation needed for a walkable and inviting environment for both residents and customers. Please leave the existing zoning and height limit intact for the site. In addition, a full environmental review of any proposal should be conducted outside of the Plan Update, and would be justified based on potential impacts to transportation, circulation, emergency response, parks and community resources demands.</p>
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The proposal to build a 7 story building at the Michael's site will make the intersection unreasonably congested and dangerous for pedestrians, cyclists, and drivers. It's already difficult to navigate safely, with cars entering the main arterials from lots extremely close to the oddly shaped intersection, with many drivers choosing to ignore the "no right turn on red" sign at the gas station corner, as well as the barrier blocking left turns out of Michael's onto Juanita drive. I really have no idea what it's going to look like with possibly 600 more resident vehicles (plus delivery/service vehicles) added into the mix—and that's not even considering the summer months when the parks and CKC draw oodles of recreationists. Furthermore, I don't imagine that it would be safe to build such a large structure on wetland/marshy soil.</p> <p>Kirkland needs more housing, to be sure. But at this particular corner of this particular intersection is going to create a traffic nightmare, and increase the risk of injury to pedestrians/cyclists, as well as collisions for motorists. Please reconsider and disallow such a large structure to be built on the Michael's property.</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I absolutely oppose creating a nightmare of traffic on 132nd off of Finn Hill. Traffic and the value to existing neighbors / home owners needs to be your priority. Not developers. We moved here for the community and neighborhood over 10 years ago and this is one of many unplanned structures where the aftermath is not thought out. Stop making a job for yourself and protect the people who live here.</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am thrilled to see the construction-friendly attitude here - don't let NIMBYs turn Washington into California. Keep housing prices under control, build market-rate housing!</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>My comments are centered around the proposed Michael's site/JBD 4 development sites.</p> <p>I've lived in Juanita for 14 years and have seen it grow and seen the need for affordable housing has grown more. Over those years I have seen countless dense developments of all kinds be built under the promise of having "affordable housing". Unfortunately none of these have brought actual affordable housing, partly because the developers have been able to just pay a fee instead of actually keeping the houses cost/rent affordable. If we truly want affordable housing, there needs to be clause in the permits that requires 70% of the units are sold/rented to the people making below 50% of the AMI based on household size and get rid of the fee option.</p> <p>Juanita's current infrastructure can not support the addition of over 1500 units. During planning of these developments there are assumptions that people in these units will use public transit, bike or walk. Often there are only parking stalls for 30-50% of the units. Unfortunately time and time again, this has not proven to be true. Not only can the roads and surrounding parking lots not handle the additional cars, there are concerns about how the water, electric and sewer systems will handle this large edition of units. These developments are slated to be at 2 of the 3 main ways on and off Finn Hill. This will add to the already long back ups during rush hour and create safety issues in emergencies. Flooding and sewer issues are a particular concern at the Michael's site as it butts up to a high sensitive area of Juanita Bay where many species of protected birds, aquatic life, amphibians and beavers all live. We also ready have too many days where the Juanita Beach is closed due to water quality issues.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am sharing my thoughts on the proposed development in the Juanita Neighborhood at both the Goodwill and Michaels sites. I understand that the city must find new places for housing to accommodate our growing population, and I support greater density. However, density without parallel investment in infrastructure and services is a bad combination. I hope the commission considers some factors before making any recommendations to the council regarding these proposed developments.</p> <p>1) Changes to zoning height - The 75' and 70' height allowances requested for these developments seem aggressive. Please consider a compromise between the current 35' or 26' limits and the requested increases. Something closer to four stories would fit in with the current apartments in Juanita Village and the surrounding housing in North Juanita.</p> <p>2) Transportation and parking - Public transit options in North Juanita are minimal. Given the current infrastructure, most folks who would live in the new apartments would likely commute by car. Decreasing the parking requirements for the Goodwill site seems shortsighted without the co-investment in local transit options. Households with two full-time workers will probably need two cars, given how far North Juanita is from work centers. This additional car activity would strain an intersection that already sees considerable traffic delays in the morning and evening commute. Given its proximity to Juanita Elementary, it would also present a potential safety issue. Many children walk to school in the morning along the street next to the proposed development. If the city is prepared to invest in additional transit options in North Juanita, it would help. For example, a local commuter bus that would circle frequently between North Juanita, Totem Lake, and Juanita Village during commuting hours would be a beneficial investment. Please think creatively about how to integrate this new traffic flow into the current situation.</p> <p>3) Parks and outdoor space - I would like the commission and city to consider requiring the developers to invest in a public outdoor space or parklets at the proposed Goodwill development. The city's parks are already under strain; Juanita Beach Park is overwhelmed on sunny days. A public outdoor space at the development would create a spot for the community and increase the attractiveness for pedestrians in the area. This foot traffic could be helpful for nearby retail and services. For the Michaels site, the emphasis should be on preserving a strong pedestrian connection between Juanita Beach Park and Juanita Bay Park.</p> <p>4) Changes to retail - Goodwill and Michaels are retail options rapidly disappearing from urban centers like Kirkland. Goodwill represents a cost-effective retail option for many of the neighbors of North Juanita. Many students at Juanita Elementary receive free or reduced-cost meals because of their family's socioeconomic status. Where will families at these income levels shop if the Goodwill is displaced? Similarly, the Michaels is deeply loved by many of our youth and seniors. I understand that the commission and city cannot control the market forces that make these businesses viable. I'd appreciate it if you could consider these changes' impact on the neighborhood. Affordability isn't just about the price of housing.</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>The proposed change in zoning for the Michael's and Goodwill sites is outrageous. Our infrastructure, determined by the unique geography of the area, cannot handle that many new units. Finn Hill residents will suffer enormously if these proposals are allowed. Please, do NOT change the zoning!</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Please do not approve increased density at the Goodwill site and Michaels site projects as amendments to the Juanita Neighborhood Plan (part of 2044 Kirkland Comprehensive Plan update).</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Safety -- Morning traffic and safety near the fire station and school are already a big concern. Traffic is regularly backed up up the hill. An electric bicyclist already crashed coming down the hill and access to the fire station could become even more blocked, further hindering emergency response times. An additional vehicle exit to the school is already needed. With any development, please be sure to add an exit or two from the school on to 100th Ave NE and/or to the rear of the school.</li> <li>2. Who is asking for greater density? Why is this being proposed?</li> <li>3. Prop 1 / Houghton Park &amp; Ride -- a. If high demand is driving a push for higher density, consider selling, at a profit, the former Houghton Park and Ride property purchased by the city that was proposed for use in the 2023 Prop to a company to develop.             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>b. It is more accessible to the highway and public transportation routes.</li> <li>c. There is more space available at this location for parking.</li> </ol> </li> <li>4. School and Tax Impacts a. Will the apartment dwellers pay property or other taxes that will support increased attendance at schools and greater use of city resources? b. Will developers pay tax for increased value and revenue of the property? c. Please share how apartment dwellers contribute to the local tax basis.</li> <li>5. Parking a. Where will parking be located for the apartments and retail space, under the buildings?</li> </ol>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Can we please stop the over-densification of the Finn Hill/Juanita area? 116th (Juanita Drive) and 132nd are two of the three main ingress and egress locations off of Finn Hill. With the schools (Juanita Elementary, Juanita H.S., Carl Sandburg, Finn Hill Middle School, and Moorlands School) in the vicinity and school bus stops, there is already too much traffic in the Finn Hill area. How about limiting the # of units in these areas rather than increasing their height? Most of these new places do not address homelessness, because many people cannot afford the rent. The recent road "improvements" on 132nd cannot handle the increased traffic, especially since the east bound lane is a bit close to the edge and has to be shared with bikers. Has anyone taken thought about the fire department's ability to dispatch quickly with that amount of congestion?</p> <p>I am very concerned and I hope you will seriously take a look at the folly of this type of density.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	As Finn Hill residents we would like to share our opinions about the very large Juanita/Finn Hill developments that have been proposed. Basically, we believe these developments are not needed nor wanted by the vast majority of our neighborhood residents whether they speak up or not. Most folks are already complaining that the traffic issues, particularly in the areas proposed, are already out of hand. Adding this many new units, therefore autos, to the already congested rush hour traffic is a horrible idea. The Goodwill project is a mega development. At that corner - add that to the traffic flow? No less irksome would be the Michaels development. On that corner...seriously?? The traffic on that corner of Juanita Drive already backs up in long lines. And that intersection is already dangerous to pedestrians and bikers. Finally, keeping the very tall buildings off the Lake side of Juanita Drive enhances the feeling of openness that we love in our area. This way everyone can appreciate at least the breeze and knowledge of the lake just over the lower height buildings. We already know about the other very large developments there are going up all over the area in general. And their impact in traffic density has not even begun to impact yet. It's time to preserve some quality of control here and we'd appreciate if our representatives did not acquiesce to every mega developers wishes.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I hope you will consider opposing the proposed zoning amendment being requested for the Michael's site for the following reasons: Increased traffic, ingress/egress issues on both properties, out of scale with neighborhood.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I support adding mixed use development with more housing at the Michael's and Goodwill sites.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Please do not approve increased density at the Goodwill site and Michaels site projects as amendments to the Juanita Neighborhood Plan
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	the redevelopment of the Goodwill site will aggravate the traffic situation in that area. The area should not be rezoned for a taller or larger (sq. feet) building. Tall buildings should be restricted to downtown Kirkland. An increase in car traffic is dangerous and not compatible with the family oriented, foot traffic already in the area. There is a great need for residential buildings that would serve the median and lower income residents who work in the city but few can afford to rent in city limits.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I support greater density. However, density without parallel investment in infrastructure and services is a bad combination. I hope the commission considers some factors before making any recommendations to the council regarding these proposed developments. 1. Changes to zoning height seem aggressive 2. Parking and transportation - public transit in the area is minimal 3. Parks and outdoor space - I would like the commission and city to consider requiring the developers to invest in a public outdoor space or parklets at the proposed Goodwill development. 4. Changes to retail - Goodwill and Michaels are retail options rapidly disappearing from urban centers like Kirkland. Goodwill represents a cost-effective retail option for many of the neighbors of North Juanita. Many students at Juanita Elementary receive free or reduced-cost meals because of their family's socioeconomic status. Where will families at these income levels shop if the Goodwill is displaced?
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Goodwill added density is not a good fit for this part of town. Added traffic will impact finn hill residents. New construction of additional homes are already unaffordable and added density to promote affordable housing is important but not at 1 million dollar selling prices.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I support dense housing at both the Goodwill and Michael's sites because it would give more people a chance to call Kirkland home.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Michaels - The current restrictions should be upheld with no exemptions allowed. The development as planned is totally inappropriate for this site. Please reject this proposal.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	More housing development is not sustainable. The Michaels & Goodwill site projects will only make a terrible situation worse. In summary, traffic congestion poses multifaceted challenges, impacting travel time, safety, the environment, and overall quality of life in Kirkland.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Support higher density mixed use zoning throughout city; reduce vehicle parking requirements.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I am very concerned about the proposed development at the current Michael's location. We cannot continue to over develop our neighborhoods, making traffic issues even worse. Traffic congestion is a pervasive issue that significantly impacts urban life.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Housing is important but it is crucial to consider the infrastructure and surrounding neighborhood when planning a massive project. Both proposals are completely out of proportion. I live on Finn Hill and there are few ways to access my home at the top of Finn Hill when coming from the south with a lot of traffic backups already. The area is just too congested. Please do not approve a change in the zoning. Our neighborhood cannot support it.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to the (2) projects at Michaels and Goodwill. No Mid-Rise Development on these (2) Properties ! The Proposed changes to Zoning is inappropriate at these (2) Locations.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Existing infrastructure will not support 600 units at the Goodwill site. There is limited access to Finn Hill already and adding more vehicles will add to the traffic in the area. We understand the need for more housing but strongly oppose this site as it will only further downgrade the quality of life in Kirkland we used to enjoy.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Retain and enforce the current zoning for the Goodwill site. 200 - 250 residential units at that site is appropriate and plenty for that location. Given the volume of traffic that already goes through that intersection, and its proximity to the elementary school and fire station, a significantly larger residential development would be inappropriate, and damaging to the neighborhood environment.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Par Mac CAR - Concerns about the negative impacts that could arise from change to building heights, setbacks, building design, traffic impact, open sky, tree canopy, and open green space. Does not support more large mix use not meeting the needs of Kirkland residents. More housing is needed, but not at the expense of the average resident of Kirkland. Supports moderate sized mixed-use with large percentage of affordable housing, adds trees, provides open sky, fosters connection and community, and protects commerce relevant to Kirkland residents.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Density studied at the Goodwill site is way too dense in number of units, scale and massing. As proposed, the project is out of touch with the surrounding community character. Traffic impacts would make a bad situation worse. Also, 600 units would necessitate additional investments in infrastructure, including utilities. Kirkland is already behind on adding Parkland per resident as stipulated in most national standards. This would require additional Parkland to meet standards. Density and size of the proposal is more keeping with the Totem Lake area or the area immediately around the 85th St. interchange. Don't start changing the character of our community and areas where it doesn't belong. We do support mixed development at this location, but it needs to be the size and scale that's more appropriate.
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	Oppose proposed development at Michaels and Goodwill. Roads serving these areas already experience unmanageable traffic volumes at peak hours. Keep tall building away from the shoreline.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>First of all I would like to say thank you to the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance for sending out an update to the community on these two huge projects. I have seen the signs in both locations, but because I have been driving by, I have not been able to read the information to see what was being considered. So thank you!</p> <p>I tend to agree with the FNHA, I am very concerned about both of these locations in terms of traffic and access. The Goodwill location is a major artery and is already very congested. I can not imagine adding 600 units to that location and trying to get students to all three schools along this route.</p> <p>In addition I would like to know from the city council what data is available on where Kirkland is at in terms of meeting the goals of reducing the housing "crisis". What numbers were mandated by the State and County, what projects have been completed and what projects are in the pipeline? When I look at the development so far it seems staggering. The acreage by Willows Road, the area by Fred Meyer and the areas around Totem Lake have exploded. I also believe that these are not affordable options for many and I wonder how it is actually helping the crisis by building housing that is still too costly. I think the Kirkland residents are due an update on this data to see where the City is at to be able to make informed decisions going forward.</p> <p>I would also like to add that the corner where Michael's is located is also very difficult to get in and out of and I can not imagine adding housing and additional retail to a place that already is quite difficult to navigate.</p> <p>Also, these two retailers are two of only a handful of affordable family friendly options in Kirkland. Losing these two businesses will hit families hard. I feel that Kirkland has lost so many family friendly businesses over the last 10 years and nothing has come up in their place after redevelopment was completed. In fact, many of these mixed use store fronts are still empty with no retail tenants. Where is the data showing that we need more businesses when we can not even fill the current sites. Business policies or financial incentives that would support small businesses would also be something for the city to consider. What is the point of mixed use storefronts that are empty for year after year - so hard to lease out that the building owners charge for street parking to help make up the losses.</p> <p>I would strongly urge the City Council to please proceed with a conservative approach in both of these locations. I know we need to support growth but sensible development needs to somehow come back into focus. At one time, buildings were not allowed to be higher than 5 stories, but the Urban Development in downtown changed that precedent and it appears that the flood gates are opening on this zoning revision unless the City Council can take a stand and say no to these powerful developers and help to maintain some sort of plan that will manage growth in a more moderate way.</p>
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Goodwill Development. Gosh I can't even imagine what anyone is thinking to even consider approving this. It is completely out of character with our Finn Hill/Kirkland livable area. Everyone knows traffic is backed up all over the place and you are considering adding that many new residential places eating up every square foot of the Goodwill store, parking lot and the bank? There is an elementary school across the street and there are moms and dads with young toddlers crossing the street on foot in the morning and in the afternoon not to mention all the school traffic. It makes no sense to be putting in a giant development complex when there's children all over the street right in front of it every single day it's an accident waiting to happen. I completely oppose this, leave it as it is, it's working fine.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I strongly oppose the two enormous housing projects that are proposed for the Michael's and Goodwill sites in Kirkland. These gigantic projects completely violate current zoning restrictions. Those zoning restrictions are in place for good reasons. Kirkland's infrastructure does NOT allow for the dire impact of tripling the zoned density of multi-unit housing projects that would exacerbate traffic and further degrade the Kirkland's character and quality of life.</p> <p>I have lived in Kirkland since 1988. I realize times change and I also am aware there is an affordable housing shortage in King County. I would support expanding King County's Urban Growth Boundary to accommodate that need. I do NOT support ruining King County's existing, already over-built suburbs in order to squeeze more "affordable" 1-million dollar units into our fully developed suburban neighborhoods. Kirkland is never again going to be the affordable suburb it was 4-5 decades ago. To meet the needs of entry-level homebuyers and population growth in the area, the only realistic, sustainable and economically sound solution will be to expand outward.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	For both the Goodwill property new housing and the Michael's property development (new housing); plans need to be in place to handle increased traffic. Right now traffic is quite terrible at many times of day.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Adding 600+ unit structures to an already congested area was poorly thought out. There is not enough transit and the destruction of the natural environment will only bring more heat and fires. Please reconsider!!!
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	The development plan for the area currently by Michaels is not viable. The property will encroach on sensitive wetlands, will cause extreme congestion at an already dangerous intersection and is way outside zoning. There are no other 7 story buildings in the lake-downtown area of Kirkland, nor should there be any. The community has not been notified of these outrageous out of scope plans. the project should be halted immediately.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	For both the Goodwill property new housing and the Michael's property development (new housing); plans need to be in place to handle increased traffic. Right now traffic is quite terrible at many times of day.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed Goodwill and Michaels zoning changes. Keep zoning as is, additional capacity will support high-priced housing, not affordable housing.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed Goodwill and Michaels zoning changes. Keep zoning as is
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed Goodwill and Michaels zoning changes. Keep zoning as is, existing traffic conditions do not support additional capacity
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	The 2 developments at the site of the Goodwill and Michael's store in Juanita would be terrible for everyone that lives here. The traffic already terrible both places! The locations would not accommodate all those cars coming and going.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Hello City council, I am writing to share my thoughts regarding the proposal to add an additional 600+ apartment spaces at the current site of the Goodwill. While I believe that Kirkland needs more housing (especially affordable housing!), I am worried about the impact of having 600 additional apartments (vs. the proposed 200-250) will have on traffic, congestion, and utilities. I urge you to look into the potential impact on the surrounding neighborhood and propose that the developer does whatever necessarily to ameliorate these issues (whether it be installing new sewer lines or widening/improving existing traffic infrastructure) before approving this project.
5/20/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed Goodwill and Michaels zoning changes. Keep zoning as is.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	I urge the Planning Commission to maintain the existing JBD 4 zoning for the southwest corner of Market and NE 116th.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	While I respect the rights of property owners to develop to maximize benefit and returns, I don't believe this location can support a development of this magnitude without infringing on the quality of life for those currently living on Finn Hill (traffic congestion). In addition, the proposed scale of the project it much too commercialized, and oversized development within this community.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	While I respect the rights of property owners to develop to maximize benefit and returns, I don't believe this location can support a development of this magnitude without infringing on the quality of life for those currently living on Finn Hill (traffic congestion). In addition, the proposed scale of the project it much too commercialized, and oversized development within this community.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	Regarding the development of the Goodwill Site. I respect the rights of property owners to develop to maximize benefit and returns, I don't believe this location can support a development of this scale without infringing on the quality of life for those currently living in proximity (traffic congestion). In addition, the proposed scale of the project it much too commercialized, and over sized development within this community. Thus I do not support any exemptions that may allow for any scale increase of any proposed development of the current Goodwill site on NE 132st and 100th ave NE. I'm a local resident living less than one mile from this site. I trust the commission will do the right thing and not grant any property use exemptions in this matter.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	Dear City of Kirkland Planning Commission, As a physician who has practiced in our community for 22 years I am very aware of the impacts of our land use and transportation decisions on the health of members of our community. I am strongly in favor of the proposed development projects on 132nd street (Old Goodwill site) and on Juanita Drive (Michael's site) We have a housing crisis in Kirkland and throughout King County. Kirkland remains unaffordable for the majority of people who work in the city. This has significant adverse consequences with longer commutes leading to air pollution and climate change. We need more density as quickly as possible. I do, however, strongly urge you to include transportation planning for the new residences in these multi family dwellings. Access to public transportation remains sub par in our city. Land use policy is transportation policy is energy policy is climate policy.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	No. Please do not do this. A seven story high rise with water views certainly does NOT support the proposed rationale provided of providing housing for all income levels. This will support high priced units only. That is not diversifying our units available. Second, the traffic at 116th/juanita/98th/100th intersection is already awful during commuting times. Adding 700 units directly at this intersection with limited east/west bus options coming off Finn Hill is going to make this a lot worse! That is not even considering that Juanita beach park is a gathering spot for our community drawing many more to this area. A 7 story high rise on the water side of Juanita drive will change the character of the neighborhood in a negative way. This is a community centered around the lake. Using the park, seeing the water from different public vantage points is what draws people to this area and supports the retail shops. I support redevelopment of this site within the density allowed by the existing restrictions, but not a 70 foot building in our beach neighborhood.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	I read about the plans to develop the Goodwill property. I understand the desire of the city to have more housing, including affordable housing. I support building apartments at the Goodwill site in line with the current zoning. however, the 7-story plan is too dense, both from the optics and the potential traffic. We already have to see nearly every day the 7-story house at Juanita bay where it was unclear to me why this could be permitted in the first place. I understand it was not part of Kirkland during construction, and the developers paid a heavy price in the form of bankruptcy and yearlong standstill of the development. I am sure you do not want to repeat this scenario. Thanks for your open communication that hopefully works both ways.
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	Supports Goodwill and Micheal's CAR land use changes to create more affordable housing
5/17/2024	Land Use Changes	Deep concern about the proposed development at the current Michaels location near Juanita Beach Park. I believe we must carefully consider the environmental impact of such a large-scale project and do not accept the requested zoning change/variance in order to protect the nearby sensitive area as well as maintaining the harmony with the surrounding buildings. Concerns about Environmental Sensitivity, Traffic and Noise, and Balancing Growth and Preservation.
5/16/2024	Land Use Changes	As a resident of Holmes Point and an architect and urban designer I support transit oriented development, housing opportunities and greater density where appropriate. However, the present proposal is development overkill. It is out of character with the local context, even if upper stories were to be set back from the property lines. I do not object to mixed use development and more housing. In fact, it could enhance the Village character. But it should be no more - and desirably less than - 5 stories, with step backs for upper floors, more akin to the character of Lake Street in downtown Kirkland. Furthermore, given the location, and regardless the height/density proposed, the City should expect any developer here to proffer substantial pedestrian and related amenities to enhance the vital connection between Juanita Bay Park and Juanita Beach Park.
5/11/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposal of turning Goodwill by 132nd and 100th into apartment/condo complex will bring too much traffic to the already-busy street! Please change it to sport field/parks for people who live in the area!
5/10/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed housing complex at the current Goodwill site (across from Juanita Elementary) is much too large for our infrastructure to support. I'm all for increasing housing but not such a large building without a clear plan to account for increased traffic in an already overly crowded traffic area. Simple building giant complexes is not the thoughtful urban planning we need.
5/9/2024	Land Use Changes	I understand that Kirkland needs housing. Desperately. But the process to get us there shouldn't be one that is opaque and difficult to see how such a fortress like structure that doesn't seek to engage and enrich the area... just no. There needs to be much better communication and thoughtful engagement with the review process. This is not the sort of thing that should be lumped in with the comprehensive plan. It's housing now; screw everything else from traffic to public services to building communities.
5/2/2024	Land Use Changes	The proposed developments at goodwill and michaels in north Kirkland are both too big. There is not enough infrastructure to support the influx of people this would bring. Please find solutions for housing that doesn't involve luxury waterfront multistory 2mil+ condos that will lead to congestion and road traffic.
5/2/2024	Land Use Changes	I support the Focused Growth Alternative as outlined in the capacity analysis memo. However, as a long term resident of Kirkland, I believe the vision outlined thus far is too conservative to fully address our housing and loneliness crises. The Kirkland 2044 Comp Plan lays the groundwork for Kirkland's future success - we should provide as many walkable housing opportunities as possible by studying and including the following actions in the plan: Eliminate parking minimums. This provides a blanket of interconnected benefits city wide. Allow for larger buildings near frequent transit. Go beyond 50 units per acre where demand for housing is highest (and not by reducing capacity in other areas). Market Street in particular is a prime candidate for transformation. Introduce a neighborhood cafe bill. let the community experiment and build new hubs of activity and culture.
5/1/2024	Land Use Changes	Support land use changes to allow for denser uses, affordable housing in general citywide in order to have a less car dependant community, to be safer, greener, resilient tax base.
4/30/2024	Land Use Changes	Support change in land use along transit corridors to increase residential capacity and density greater than 50 dwelling units per acre to allow for more housing for people
4/30/2024	Land Use Changes	Support greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre; TOD; build more apartments; allow commercial uses in residential areas
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes including along transit corridors

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Support proposed land use changes; allow greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Support proposed land use changes; allow greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes including along transit corridors; focus growth in Totem Lake with improved vehicle access
8/23/2014	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I used to ride the 255 everyday to work in downtown Seattle - I could walk to Market Street and take the bus all the way downtown. Over the years, that route has been eliminated. Now I have to transfer buses to get downtown and it takes an hour and a half, as opposed to 45 minutes. It's no longer feasible to rely on public transportation to attend sporting events and concerts in Seattle.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm a home-owner in North Rose Hill since 1996, and would like to provide feedback on the city's 2044 comprehensive plan.</p> <p>Goals and Vision The plan appears to be based on goals and a vision that are too liable to change over the next 20 years. Setting in motion actions to achieve goals that may or may not be relevant in 20 years seems needlessly risky. Perhaps a better approach for such a large undertaking would be to define a set of checkpoints where progress and goals will be re-evaluated. I don't see that anywhere in the plan.</p> <p>Priorities I'm very concerned that potential future residents are being prioritized over current residents. Some of the implementation details in the plan will negatively impact some aspects of Kirkland that make it such a great place to live. Here are two examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transit corridors through North Rose Hill. The plan shows that 124th Ave NE between 85th street and 124th street will become a "transit corridor". I think it's clear that existing home owners in North Rose Hill will be negatively impacted by the increased traffic and replacement of single family neighborhood homes with apartments. What's not clear to me is why the city would choose to invest this way when there's already a much bigger "transit corridor" just a few hundred yards away. I405 is already there, and it's already getting massive upgrades to improve capacity, throughput, accessibility, and public transportation. Why would the city attempt to duplicate this just a few hundred yards away? Especially given the dollar costs, but also the "quality of life" costs to the existing neighborhoods.</li> <li>2. Routing commuter traffic through our neighborhoods. By increasing traffic capacity (more lanes, higher speed limits) through our neighborhoods, the city is encouraging commuters to "short cut" on our streets. The city could choose to discourage this behavior and instead route traffic to I405, but that's not happening, and the K2044 plan makes this even worse than it already is. I invite members of the planning commission to visit this stretch of 124th Ave NE at 5pm on a Wednesday afternoon. You'll see mile-long line of standing traffic as commuters avoid I405 and cut through our neighborhood instead. It's not clear at all why the city is choosing this strategy.</li> </ol> <p>Housing</p> <p>The 2044 plan conflates housing availability with housing prices. I think you would agree that the city has added a significant number of housing units over the past 5 years, and there's a fairly deep pipeline of projects underway to bring even more housing online. I think you would also agree that housing prices in Kirkland have not gone down. They haven't even stabilized. Please don't destroy our neighborhoods based on a strategy that has not been effective. The fact is, there are a lot of high-income folks in the area that are willing to pay very high prices to live in Kirkland. It's just not clear that we can build our way out of this problem. That is, without doing something so extreme as to destroy the underlying quality and character of our wonderful city. I agree that housing costs in Kirkland are extremely high. I'd ask the city council to consider the idea that some areas are just expensive. Kirkland is one of those (and for good reason! It's an awesome place!). I would love to have a loft apartment in Manhattan that overlooks central park. I can't afford that, so I don't live there. I love the idea of focusing on 2 or 3 areas (e.g. Totem Lake Village, Juanita Village, Houghton, ...) where the city can enable a ton of dense housing, a ton of infrastructure, and a ton of support services for that housing. "Spreading the pain" across all neighborhoods seems like the wrong approach. You can't make the entirety of Kirkland a "10 minute city". Pick some targets and focus. Enable awesome transit solutions (a variety, highly available, highly reliable, very low-cost/free) in and out of those hubs .....</p>
9/1/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a long time resident of Downtown Kirkland. I am Firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for All of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed
9/1/2024	Land Use Changes	I am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly AGAINST the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed.
8/29/2024	Land Use Changes	A neighbor of mine has a yard sign out inviting folks to sign the petition at cherishkirkland.org. So, I took a look at it, and at the V.2 Draft Land Use Element on the city website. And I have concluded that the folks promoting the petition are seriously misrepresenting the content of the plan. Therefore, we would like to state for the record that we support the planned growth and zoning changes.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/28/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Here is a great analysis by Richard Carlson a member of Cherish Kirkland in case you have not see his post on Facebook:  OVERKILL Kirkland's housing affordability problem is evidence of success, not failure. To its natural economic advantage of being located near three of the hottest labor markets on earth, Redmond, Bellevue and Lake Union, Kirkland added good schools, great parks and lovely neighborhoods providing attractive lifestyles ranging from semi-rural to urban. As local employment of high-income tech workers boomed over the last decade, no power on earth could have prevented those high-income workers from bidding up the price of Kirkland's attractive housing. Microsoft alone doubled its employment and wages over the last decade, and many of those "softies", in their tens of thousands, wanted to live in Kirkland. The fundamental problem facing Kirkland is how to ameliorate the resulting problem of unaffordable housing without destroying the lovely environment that helped create the problem. I spent nearly 30 years, 1976-2003, dealing with exactly the same problem in Palo Alto, California, where I worked and lived. The only difference is that Palo Alto home prices exploded 20 years before the same thing happened in Kirkland. Policymakers in both communities must face the same fundamental reality: 1. Neither community will ever be "affordable" again, at least not in the lifetimes of anyone reading this document. The housing problem can be improved, but not solved. 2. All new construction will serve the high-income market. It is impossible to actually build new affordable housing without huge subsidies; costs of land and labor are too high. 3. Transportation is the ultimate limit to home construction. Overbuilding could easily lead to gridlock. 4. The lifestyles of the new high-income residents will require flexible, personal transportation: cars. Their time is far to valuable to wait for or fit with a bus schedule. 5. The scarcest resource is family housing, and that demand is and will be mostly for single family homes. Given these constraints, the reasonable approach would be to rezone older commercial and residential areas adjacent to workplaces and transportation hubs. Kirkland has already done this. Multi-family construction has boomed both in downtown and Totem Lake. Enough rezoning is already in place to substantially increase housing supply by 15 to 20,000 units. That is more than enough supply to both meet state standards and sharply slow the rise in rents. It also means a huge population increase; 20,000 more units means about 50,000 more people and 30,000 more cars, a 50% increase. The transportation problems created by this rezoning, alone, may well be more than the existing system can handle. Gridlock is already occurring, and will clearly get worse. Instead of building on this base and facing the coming transportation problems, the Kirkland Planning Commission staff is proposing to leapfrog to the largest land use changes ever attempted by a settled American community. The proposed land use plan allows rezoning of an enormous area, 1 mile across and 9 miles long. That is 9 square miles or over 6,000 acres. It allows rezoning from single family residential to 4-6 story multifamily 1/4 mile one each side of the two main north south corridors that extend the whole length of the city. This allows rezoning of all of Kirkland south of Central street and much of it to the north. Upzoning from current levels, less than 10 units an acre, to the new levels, over 40 units an acre is an increase of over 30 units per acre. Discounting for parks, current zoning and other geographic limits, we're still talking about 100,000 potential net new units, or a new population of about 250,000, a total of 3.5 times the current population. The staff contends that the land use plan does not change the zoning, it "only allows" re-zoning. That is nonsense. Once the city allows such re-zoning, a wave of rezoning requests will overwhelm the community. If the city refuses, a wave of lawsuits will follow. Rezoning at this level in this community is worth a million dollars an acre, which will pay for a lot of lawyers. Developers are already financing a group of well organized high-density proponents that is first in line at every hearing. Once the land use plan is approved, the developer has the legal upper hand. The city will have to prove that the specific rezoning proposal, which will now be consistent with the General Plan, should not be approved. No other community in the nation has ever tried such a massive rezoning.</p>
8/28/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I would like to add my voice to those that oppose the proposal to allow 4-6 story, high-density development within .25 miles of either side of transit corridors immediately to the north of the downtown area. Kirkland is a wonderful, livable city, and potential development of this nature would have a significant, detrimental impact on these neighborhoods, including, but not exclusively, the availability of street parking and the property values of nearby homes. I can envision these types of developments immediately adjacent to the transit corridors in question (e.g. along Market street), but to allow for such structures to be built as far as .25 miles away in the middle of a neighborhood of single-family homes would forever alter the nature of these neighborhoods.</p>
8/27/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>We request that all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items be removed. City Staff have included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element which is still vague, and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. The plan update eliminates 'Residential' land-use designations. Changing all these areas to 'Residential Mixed-Use' is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones."</p> <p>We strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, including the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) The City should stay focused on existing plans already in effect like the 85th Street Station Area Plan, missing middle zoning, and existing commercial centers, as well as existing policies, goals, and commitment to building the infrastructure and services to make existing plans a reality.</li> <li>2) Transit service hours continue to decline across the City, along with ridership. The reliability of the bus system is strained, given the poor transportation connectivity across our city. To suddenly say there is capacity to build more housing simply because there is an existing bus line is hard to understand from a practical point of view.</li> <li>3) Kirkland will exceed its growth targets without transit corridors.</li> </ol>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/26/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. My main concerns are traffic, parking and this drive for affordable housing.</p> <p>1) Traffic: Are you going to study traffic in these transit corridors during the fall when kids go back to school and our traffic is heaviest? Market Street often comes to a complete stop during the school year especially when there are backups on I405.</p> <p>2) Parking, we travel on 16th Ave West from our home to Market Street, we always have to wait coming and going for a car to pass parked cars before we can continue, what if there was a fire or emergency, how would these vehicles be able to get down our neighborhood? What about kids and dogs walking on a street with no consistent sidewalks. I've talked with store employees that work at Michaels in Juanita, they live in apartments in the Juanita area, they have told me not enough parking has been provided which means they need to park in retail parking lots and now I've heard they are ticketing in Juanita, where are these people going to park with this increased density.</p> <p>3) I read in last Sunday's Seattle Times opinion page that Seattle's office of housing last month released an unprecedented \$14 million to stabilize the balance sheets of affordable housing providers in financial trouble. Why do we want to expose our precious city of Kirkland to these kinds of costs and abuses. Tenants are not paying their rents; housing operators are having to repair damaged units while insurance costs spiral ever higher. There is a backlog of 2,163 pending tenant/landlord cases in King County Superior Court, even if a tenant is served with an eviction notice they know the courts are horribly backed up and their chance of eviction is remote, so they continue to NOT pay their rent. There is property destruction and cleanup and drug contamination costing developers thousands of dollars. Why do we want to expose our city of Kirkland to these problems and astronomical expenses? I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/26/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As 25-year residents of Norkirk, just two blocks from Market Street, we have witnessed a significant increase in vehicular traffic over the years. The traffic density has escalated to levels where accessing Market Street from the side streets is often impossible during peak hours on weekdays. Additionally, the weekend closures of 85th Street for the I-405 Interchange Project have caused traffic back-ups on Market Street to spill over into Saturdays and Sundays. .... the bumper-to-bumper traffic on Market Street forms an impenetrable divide between the Market and Norkirk neighborhoods. These regular and foreseeable traffic jams render Market Street ineffective as an arterial route. .... As a result, traffic from Finn Hill and areas north of Kirkland reroutes to Market Street, exacerbating its congestion. Looking ahead 20 years, Policy LU 2.4 anticipates a staggering 1079% increase in housing units and a 489% increase in employment within the proposed Market Street Transit Corridor. Despite these projections, the 2044 Comprehensive Plan lacks a strategy for expanding transportation capacity, including transit options. Thus, we stand firmly opposed to the inclusion of transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan and request the removal of all aspects of Policy LU-2.4 and related items. ...the latest Land Use Element draft, it remains ambiguous and does not address the core issues associated with the transit corridors. Furthermore, we are concerned about the plan's removal of "Residential" land use designations, transitioning these areas to "Residential Mixed Use." This represents a substantial shift for Kirkland neighborhoods, as Residential Mixed-Use permits small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses within residential areas. The plan fails to clarify which characteristics of Residential zones, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones, would be preserved. We strongly recommend that the Planning Commission consider an amendment to the Land Use Element that would exclude transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/25/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I support the FHNA comments regarding the Land Use Element. In addition I would like to see language incentivizing development with green roofs, green walls, and bioswales.</p>
8/24/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I've been following the city hall hearings and noticed __ comments about school capacity concerns. There are counterarguments, supported by data from Seattle, suggesting that condominium developments actually reduce school enrollments because these units aren't family friendly. This reduction in school enrollment in Seattle's urban areas is troubling to me, as it indicates that such developments drive families away, not just from the developments themselves but from surrounding blocks as well. Families are the bedrock of our society. The urban areas in Seattle have driven families to the Eastside, and we should avoid pushing families out of Kirkland. Therefore, I support urbanization only in urban villages like Totem Lake and urge the removal of transport corridors from comprehensive plans. If we need more capacity, we can create more urban villages, which have been a success story for our town. The loss of family habitats is a major reason why many urban areas experience negative growth rates and their associated consequences.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Thank you for providing time for residents to share thoughts and concerns over the potential Transit Corridor Plan. I know that you all are very busy, so I'll submit my comments in bulleted thoughts in an effort to respect your time. Growing Kirkland -</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Planning for growth and affordable housing is non-negotiable. We should not be wasting any time in community meetings with public comments that approach these goals as a pro or con, as if the purpose of the meeting is to debate this issue itself.</li> <li>•I have concerns about increasing density along current transit routes as it does not allow for the flexibility that may be needed in the future. Kirkland will forever be locked into this layout. Rather than establishing Transit Corridors, one thought would be to bring the transit to the neighborhoods. This could be in the form of small, city run, minibuses. This would allow for flexibility to build denser housing anywhere in the city where the opportunity matches the needs. The minibuses could serve as the bridge between the neighborhoods and the transit centers. If interested, I would be glad to share my experiences living in places with such a convenient resource.</li> <li>•The wider community conversation should be around truly innovative ways to meet goals of growth and affordability. Kirkland has the opportunity to establish very creative ways to do this. Transit Corridors are only one option. It is clearly not being well received by all stakeholders. We are a city full of smart, creative, knowledgeable people, most of whom are very sympathetic to the needs of all. We can figure this out together given your leadership around soliciting and creating innovative solutions.</li> <li>•Please seek out and nurture the input from multiple resources to propose innovative solutions. Consider eliciting thoughtful input from residents, experts, and even involve students and schools in the problem solving process. The focus should be not on if we should increase density and affordability, but rather HOW we can achieve this.</li> </ul> <p>Managing Meetings - I know you are aware of how stressful these proposals are to many members of our community. It is becoming easier to disengage from the process when established behavioral expectations at meetings are not being adhered to. This is the third meeting I've attended in which there has been excessive smirking and eye rolling when speakers are sharing their thoughts. This is especially evident during zoom meetings because we can see the faces of many audience members near the podium. I would have liked to have publicly shared my thoughts last night (8/22) but after over two hours of seeing outright disdain by members in the audience I didn't feel like I wanted to subject myself to that. Thank you, to whoever it was on the panel who called out an audience member on that. Please do more of this.</p>
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Thank you to the Commission and City Staff, who are working hard on this comprehensive plan and thank you for taking the time to consider resident input. I, along with my family of four, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan</p>
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am compelled to write to you with a deep sense of urgency regarding the proposed upzoning within the 2044 comprehensive development plan. The drastic increase in density slated for neighborhoods such as Houghton, South Rose Hill, North Rose Hill, Market, Norkirk, Juanita, a now Finn Hill is not only alarming but also poses a grave threat to the essence of our community. The upzoning proposal, as it stands, is a blatant disregard for the character and scale of Kirkland's residential neighborhoods—attributes that have been a cornerstone of our city's charm and a primary reason why residents have chosen to make it their home. The prospect of 4-6 story buildings looming over our streets, with scant setbacks and inadequate parking, is unacceptable. This is not a mere change; it is a radical overhaul that risks the very identity of our neighborhoods and public safety. The comprehensive plan's failure to address the repercussions of increased density on our already burdened infrastructure is a glaring oversight. Our streets, such as Lake Street, Market Street, and 6th Street, cannot sustain the inevitable surge in traffic and the associated safety hazards, including impeded access for emergency vehicles and school buses. The notion that these Transit Corridors, which lack proximity to essential businesses, can support a car-independent lifestyle is unrealistic and ill-conceived. Many surrounding cities reference the State Environmental Policy Act (SEPA), which mandates a 'no action' alternative and at least two reasonable alternatives. I do not see any reasonable alternatives listed in Kirkland's 2044 plan. I highly encourage the council to take immediate action to reevaluate these upzoning measures. Grow responsibly with community involvement, please remove the transit corridors from the comprehensive plan!</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes	As a resident of Kirkland for 22 years, along with my husband and two kids are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU 2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm sorry but was not able to provide virtual comment tonight, but wanted to register my opinion and that of my 5 person family.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Public Outreach is difficult, but until very recently, I was not aware of this Planning Commission proposal, so I have to say, that respectfully the outreach has not been ideal and transparent.</li> <li>2. Conceptually, I'm not against transit density, but I do disagree with the size, and scope of the proposal both in the width of a 1/4 mile as well as elevation. Keep it at 2-3 stories</li> <li>3. We have existing residential zoning that is allowing for greater density in already the most dense city on the east side. Our existing zoning can and will accommodate our current and future growth targets.</li> <li>4. We have the commercial zones such as Totem Lake, Finn Hill QFC area, Rose Hill 85th st and Juanita Village that are nowhere near maximized and should be made into dense urban centers first.</li> <li>5. Lastly, we are opening the door to even greater density before evaluating major changes in density that have recently gone into effect. Why are we further increasing density, before evaluating our recent changes?</li> </ol> <p>So to summarize:            We have ample residential zoning            We have ample commercial zoning that should be maximized and developed first in urban centers            We should evaluate the impact of recent zoning changes before doubling down on greater changes            The size and scope of the proposed "framework" bisects neighborhoods, creates divisions, blocks light and views and are drastically out of scale. (Stick to 2-3 stories)</p> <p>I'm a progressive voter that has voted to approve every levy, every park proposal and all transit packages that have been put to a vote, but this is simply not in keeping with the character of the town I love. Density can be accomplished in a more thoughtful way.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am writing to express my opposition to the proposal for higher-density housing along the "transit corridor." While the intention to increase housing availability and promote public transit use is understandable, I believe increasing the density of housing in our neighborhood will inevitably place a significant strain on existing infrastructure. Roads, schools, and healthcare facilities are already operating near or at capacity. Without substantial investment in expanding these services, further development will lead to overcrowding, decreased quality of service, and potentially a decline in the overall quality of life for current residents.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am opposed the Market Street corridor Plan. Again, I oppose the Market Street frequent transit designation. There are better locations which will have a greater impact on affordable housing such as 85th corridor, K line, one story old strip malls with huge surface parking lots, transit station at south Kirkland near 520). Stacked flats at existing large underutilized commercially zone property makes more sense. A 1.5 million dollar 1100 sq ft townhome does very little for affordable housing and ADA accessibility. I am disappointed in the current plan and also the decision not to notify property owners.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I am currently at the Kirkland city council right now for the planning commission meeting. Clearly I will very unlikely be able to submit an oral comment, so I'd like to submit my comment here. I am writing about Kirkland's 2044 land use and housing plan. My family has lived on the Eastside for 3 generations. My grandfather was a very wealthy man who owned around 10 properties. He assumed that guarding his wealth by fighting against affordable housing was key to his family's security. Well, it only took 2 generations, and the wealth is gone. Just recently, my brother had to move to Tacoma, and my husband and I are struggling to buy a home even though we both have PhDs and work in tech. There are people who are against affordable and higher density housing. Plainly, these decisions increase housing costs. Maybe their wealth will live for many generations and they will be luckier than my family. But for most people, it won't. If people want to spend time with their grandchildren, they have to make sure they can live near them. My grandfather put his wealth ahead of me and my family's future. As a parent now, I could never do this to my child. Please do not leverage my future and my children's future for other people's retirement. I support a Kirkland 2044 growth strategy that includes affordable housing and public transit for residents from all backgrounds and income levels.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	Please think about how this is going to change people's life. Traffic is already bad as is and I don't know with changing zoning how worse it's going to get. Traffic is really bad in lake Washington boulevard and Juanita. Please don't be out of touch and don't do this. Consider a couple of days at rush hour driving in and see how bad it is.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I write again regarding the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, both generally and specifically as to the Land Use Element and Policy LU-2.4. First and foremost, while the purpose of a Comprehensive Plan is to develop and have in place a plan to handle the development and growth of Kirkland for the next 20 years, what has been proposed and is being recommended is not a plan at all. Rather, city staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council seem to believe that the solution to all of our problems is "build, baby, build" without regard to anything else. How do we solve our housing issues? Build. What about the fact that building more will only marginally lower housing costs but not actually provide affordable housing? No worries, just build. What about the lack of infrastructure? No worries, just build and it will happen. Has that actually worked? No. Exhibit A - Kirkland Urban and expanded Google campus on 108th yet no new or expanded infrastructure on Central Way, Kirkland Ave., State Street, 3rd, or 6th/108th. All of those streets experienced gridlock before those new developments. All remain gridlocked, despite the fact that there are more people working from home since the pandemic, and the gridlock continues to get worse. Our bus service has actually decreased since before Urban and the Google campus expansion. Additionally, the proposal fails to acknowledge the lack of ability along several of the proposed "Transit Corridors" to even provide for the necessary infrastructure to support the increased densities and intensities proposed along the corridors. Further, a plan should be clear as to what we want to accomplish in each area of the city. Several Commissioners and Councilmembers have stated that there is no intent to allow for 4-6 story buildings throughout the entirety of the proposed Transit Corridors. If that's true, then why not draft a Comprehensive Plan that specifies what we actually are trying to plan for? The proposal does not address how we reach the targeted affordable housing units given the current max requirement that any development with 6 or more units must have 10% of the units be "affordable" and that only goes to affordability for those at 80% AMI. Has the PC or CC even considered an alternative such as Affordable Housing Overlay Zones to avoid the unintended consequences of gentrification and displacement from upzoning (<a href="https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrscinsight/april-2022/using-affordable-housing-overlay-zones">https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrscinsight/april-2022/using-affordable-housing-overlay-zones</a>)? It certainly does not appear that this has been considered. Nothing about this process has been transparent and it has been rushed without sufficient thought and consideration for the potential impacts and for robust community engagement. The current proposed amendments eliminate "residential" as a land use designation in favor of "residential mixed use." This is a significant change for all of our Kirkland neighborhoods as it would allow small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in ALL of our current residential neighborhoods. The plan does not identify what other features of residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. Nor does it consider whether all of the current residential neighborhoods can reasonably accommodate all uses allowed by "residential mixed use." I strongly urge the Planning Commission to opt for Option B proposed in the Staff Report for the Planning Commission meeting and hearing on August 22, 2024 - Do NOT include Policy LU-2.4 in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan but either add a discrete task to a future Planning Work Program to study a policy directing exploration of appropriate places for density near transit or consider adding a version of the policy to the Comprehensive Plan in 5 years after there has been time to further consider, revise, and take full community feedback on any proposed changes.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing in support of the proposal to add a Transit Corridor Element (and all of Policy LU-2.4) to the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan. I urge the planning commission and the City Council to incorporate it in the next version of the comprehensive plan. Increased Capacity is vital along those transit corridors capable of supporting it. The addition of capacity of at least 50 units/acre should be considered as options going forward and not taken off the table at this time. We need to have that option going forward. My wife and I have been Kirkland residents for over 25 years and would like to see the damage done by unaffordable housing created by overly restrictive zoning become undone. When we moved here in the 90s those who worked here could live here and know that this can again become the case with higher densities creating more homes for everyone. Housing affordability becomes affordability in all other areas because the cost of housing is reflected in the cost of labor. Making housing more affordable makes everything more affordable. We're lucky, we bought a house in Kirkland when it was still affordable to do so. That gives me the right and ability to petition the city council and planning commission to please create Transit Corridor elements in the Comprehensive Plan. But those priced out of Kirkland, the people who work in grocery stores, nail salons, restaurants, car repair shops, and retail cannot petition the council/commission because they have no standing. I speak for them.</p> <p>Kirkland is car dependent, with few truly walkable neighborhoods. Well planned higher density creates walkability, which is a much better urban experience that also reduces fossil fuel consumption (a very important consideration, housing policy is also climate policy). Please think of everyone, and what we need Kirkland to become. Please do not become dissuaded from adding elements that would allow rational density to be added to the comprehensive plan. Let us not prevent solutions from being considered because rich landowners don't want to share Kirkland with anyone else.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am a Norkirk resident and small business owner. I participated in the Land Use and Transportation focus group in May, and I'm very grateful to see many of the comments expressed by participants reflected in the draft Land Use Element update. I support greater density to address housing affordability and climate change, especially density around transit corridors (yes, even in Norkirk!!).</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am speaking against the changes in the areas around some of the designated "Transportion Corridors"outlined in the Market Street Corridor Plan and Land Use Element. I will base my comments on the Norkirk area that I have represented since 1998, serving on the first Norkirk Neighborhood Association Board and continuing to serve on this Board since that time with a break for the years I served on the Planning Commission myself. I will use my thoughts on this neighborhood as an example of issues that could arise in many other areas designated as being on along a "Transportion Corridor." Norkirk neighbors have long supported the idea of finding ways to introduce some smaller and hopefully more affordable housing options, allowing for more "density done right!" options in Norkirk. We introduced and adopted the small lot single family zoning, ADUs, and duplexes and triplexes that look or are compatible with existing housing. However, what is being suggested now is extreme and unnecessary. Unique things to protect in Norkirk and Market along the proposed Transportion Corridor are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-they are two of the most historic areas especially close to Market St.</li> <li>-The views from the streets on the slopes above Market St. in Norkirk are not just enjoyed by the homeowners there but are very popular walking routes for many people from farther east in the neighborhood who walk along 1st and 2nd Streets every night.</li> <li>-Many people have already commented on the narrow streets that cannot accommodate more traffic.</li> </ul> <p>I think it would be criminal to block those wonderful views, cherished by many, by increasing allowed heights and exessive density, These policies being proposed will affect many areas negatively and the way they are written will likely not promoted affordability any more than what current zoning allows for. We already are seeing many new projects under current zoning that are increasing density while not destroying the feel of our existing neighborhoods. There are many references in the draft Norkirk Neighborhood 2044 update that point to increased density being compatible in scale and mass and trees and setbacks to the existing properties around them (pol. N-29/N-24,N-12 and many more. Unfortunately, I have been out of town and unable to truly engage in this conversation, but I think the proposed ideas should NOT be adopted without much more discussion. They need to be postponed until they can be studied more thoughtfully. THEY DO NOT HAVE TO BE ADOPTED NOW AS PART OF THIS 2044 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I have lived in Kirkland for over 50 years. During that time I worked in Kirkland for only 11 years of my post graduate careers. The other 34 years, as an educator, I had to commute to other communities which required a car to get to my schools. Many of the people who live in Kirkland must also commute outside of Kirkland..... With changing the existing density policy, this traffic issue will only become worse. You have stated that commutes can happen through the Kirkland corridors because of public transportation, but that public transportation isn't truly there yet and it isn't possible for all workers to get to their place of employment with public transportation. Also citizens with mobility issues .....are not able to access much of the 10 min. Idea for the higher density. This idea seems to be for a younger crowd and/or for those who do not have mobility issues. Also much older adults must be transported by car or a vehicle to be able to leave their homes. ....These people are also residents of Kirkland who need to be considered when making policies. ....how the city will support the school district with money for more schools and land to use to support more schools. .... Higher density means higher student numbers. The Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance has also brought up a concern about wording with green spaces, parks, etc. I would highly recommend their requests to be added to any plans. While I feel that Kirkland can grow with some very careful plans and policies, I do not support the density levels that the developers would like to see in our city. I highly request that we continue with the very well thought out density policies that are already in place today. This work was done carefully in the past and should be continued. Kirkland has a lot more work and infrastructure to have in place before we can handle beyond the density policies we have right now.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing in support of moving forward with the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan. We have lived in Kirkland for over 22 years. Our oldest daughter works in the area. She lives with us because she currently cannot afford housing. My husband and I are looking to downsize in the next few years but feel like the options for aging in place are lacking in Kirkland. We love this city and would like to stay. I recognize that growth is inevitable. I support increased housing and transportation-oriented development to accommodate this growth and to keep our city healthy and liveable. Thank you for all your hard work on this plan. I know you are considering the future of ALL Kirkland residents, not just one neighborhood.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing in support of the comments from The Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance regarding the proposed traffic corridor plan. I support the recommendation for stronger language in the land use element concerning green space acquisition. Once land is developed, it's gone!</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm planning on speaking tonight at the public hearing but I wanted to send you my comments as prepared ahead of time both for the record and also in case I don't make it for whatever reason. I'm here tonight to speak in strong support of building more housing, especially along transit. I moved to Kirkland 15 years ago..... I moved around a lot. I've lived in 16 different homes since I was born, but Kirkland is the first place that I've really put down roots. At various times I've been a renter, an owner, and even a landlord..... thousands of people commute from Mill Creek, Monroe, Marysville, Maltby, to make the soul-sucking drive to Kirkland. They are our nurses, teachers, cops, ..... Leave to go back home. This dynamic really hurts our local businesses who struggle to attract and retain employees. They have to pay more to compensate for either higher rents or longer commutes and this, in turn, raises all of our prices and cost of living. A higher home value (which is entirely theoretical unless you're getting ready to sell and move somewhere else) is little consolation in the face of quickly rising prices at restaurants, retail, and services around town. At a recent neighborhood association meeting, I heard a police officer who has been serving Kirkland for almost 15 years literally laugh out loud when someone assumed she lived in Kirkland. "Oh, I don't live in Kirkland, I live in ..... We can do better. We can stop deliberately excluding people from our neighborhoods. We don't have to listen to the person bragging on social media about putting signs opposing new housing at both of their houses while regular, hardworking folks in our community are forced out and kept out. The artificial housing scarcity we've created is a choice. And as a choice we can change it</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm a resident of Kirkland, living on Finn Hill. I strongly believe that your Transit Corridor Proposal is mis guided. What motivates this proposal? As I understand, Kirkland has already met the GMA criteria for King County. We don't need more congestion, and we don't want to see the basic character of those affected neighborhoods changed</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I write again regarding the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, both generally and specifically as to the Land Use Element and Policy LU-2.4.</p> <p>First and foremost, while the purpose of a Comprehensive Plan is to develop and have in place a plan to handle the development and growth of Kirkland for the next 20 years, what has been proposed and is being recommended is not a plan at all. Rather, city staff, the Planning Commission, and City Council seem to believe that the solution to all of our problems is "build, baby, build" without regard to anything else. How do we solve our housing issues? Build. What about the fact that building more will only marginally lower housing costs but not actually provide affordable housing? No worries, just build. What about the lack of infrastructure? No worries, just build and it will happen. Has that actually worked? No. Exhibit A - Kirkland Urban and expanded Google campus on 108th yet no new or expanded infrastructure on Central Way, Kirkland Ave., State Street, 3rd, or 6th/108th. All of those streets experienced gridlock before those new developments. All remain gridlocked, despite the fact that there are more people working from home since the pandemic, and the gridlock continues to get worse. Our bus service has actually decreased since before Urban and the Google campus expansion. Additionally, the proposal fails to acknowledge the lack of ability along several of the proposed "Transit Corridors" to even provide for the necessary infrastructure to support the increased densities and intensities proposed along the corridors.</p> <p>Further, a plan should be clear as to what we want to accomplish in each area of the city. Several Commissioners and Councilmembers have stated that there is no intent to allow for 4-6 story buildings throughout the entirety of the proposed Transit Corridors. If that's true, then why not draft a Comprehensive Plan that specifies what we actually are trying to plan for? The proposal does not address how we reach the targeted affordable housing units given the current max requirement that any development with 6 or more units must have 10% of the units be "affordable" and that only goes to affordability for those at 80% AMI. Has the PC or CC even considered an alternative such as Affordable Housing Overlay Zones to avoid the unintended consequences of gentrification and displacement from upzoning (<a href="https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrsc-insight/april-2022/using-affordable-housing-overlay-zones">https://mrsc.org/stay-informed/mrsc-insight/april-2022/using-affordable-housing-overlay-zones</a>)? It certainly does not appear that this has been considered.</p> <p>Nothing about this process has been transparent and it has been rushed without sufficient thought and consideration for the potential impacts and for robust community engagement. The current proposed amendments eliminate "residential" as a land use designation in favor of "residential mixed use." This is a significant change for all of our Kirkland neighborhoods as it would allow small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in ALL of our current residential neighborhoods. The plan does not identify what other features of residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. Nor does it consider whether all of the current residential neighborhoods can reasonably accommodate all uses allowed by "residential mixed use."</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to opt for Option B proposed in the Staff Report for the Planning Commission meeting and hearing on August 22, 2024 - Do NOT include Policy LU-2.4 in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan but either add a discrete task to a future Planning Work Program to study a policy directing exploration of appropriate places for density near transit or consider adding a version of the policy to the Comprehensive Plan in 5 years after there has been time to further consider, revise, and take full community feedback on any proposed changes</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I'm writing regarding Draft Policy LU-2.4 of the proposed Comprehensive Plan. For decades, Kirkland has been a leader in planning gracefully for growth. In 1990, we were instrumental in establishing the groundwork and implementation of Washington's Growth Management Act. Since then, countless staff, Council, and citizen hours have gone into making sound land use decisions. As Councilmember Pascal has noted, now is the time for us to stay focused on existing plans—they are working! The purpose of my letter is to support, with some modifications, the wording option of DRAFT Policy LU-2.4 suggested by Adam Weinstein and Allison Zike in their July 26 MEMORANDUM to Kurt Triplett:</p> <p>Suggested wording for DRAFT Policy LU-2.4: Create additional capacity for higher-density residential along identified frequent transit corridors citywide, but only after both the Sound Transit I-405 Stride BRT service and the King County Metro K-Line transit service have been implemented, and the need for additional housing capacity along the specified corridors has been demonstrated. As you've noted, the Council may update the Comprehensive Plan every year, and the next major Comprehensive Plan update will occur in 2034, allowing future councils to adjust with real information once new transit service is implanted. If both Sound Transit I-405 Stride BRT service and the King County Metro K-Line transit service are indeed in operation by 2030, this gives the City ample time to determine whether additional capacity is warranted. Transit Corridor 5 is home to—and contains walking routes for—at least eight schools. I would think this alone would warrant special consideration when discussing adding lanes and capacity to 108th Ave NE. Councilmember Pascal has made excellent points, so I've reposted them here (below). I agree with all his comments and would like my support noted. If you haven't read and considered Jon's points, I hope you will do so.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am speaking against the changes in the areas around some of the designated "Transportion Corridors" outlined in the Market Street Corridor Plan and Land Use Element. Norkirk neighbors have long supported the idea of finding ways to introduce some smaller and hopefully more affordable housing options, allowing for more "density done right!" options in Norkirk. We introduced and adopted the small lot single family zoning, ADUs, and duplexes and triplexes that look or are compatible with existing housing. ....My wife Martha and I agree with what Janet and John Pruitt have written. In addition we would like to see a more comprehensive plan for our Norkirk neighborhood ( and surrounding neighborhoods) with at least a 100 (one hundred) year timeline that addresses the following:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) how are streets going to be rebuilt to accommodate increased traffic and density,</li> <li>2) if the goal is to make our neighborhood more "walkable and bikeable" to do errands, grocery shopping and the like because there will be less automobiles, how will residents be able to accomplish these tasks if car movement is restricted? For example will zoning be changed to encourage more local grocery markets like has been done in Seattle in areas like Capital Hill, West Seattle, Magnolia and Ballard over the last 100 years?</li> <li>3) These most recent proposed changes feel like the goal posts keep getting moved on planning for our fine city. How about being more transparent with an eye to the future for Kirkland that encompasses a much longer timeframe as proposed here in my letter.</li> </ol>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>It's very concerning to me that Kirkland's current approach offers only two limited choices for the Planning Commission and City Council to consider for SEPA review: a no-change option and a growth alternative that heavily impacts our neighborhoods through the transit corridors proposal. Our neighborhoods have already absorbed substantial growth through the recent passage of missing middle housing legislation, which I fully support. The transit corridors first appeared in a Planning Commission memo only 8 months ago with the first Land Use public hearing 4 months ago. The transit corridor proposal feels insufficient and radical. I urge you instead to seek practical, factual, sustainable, and data-driven growth options for both our current community and future residents. We deserve better. The transit corridors do not represent responsible growth or offer any data-driven solutions to the affordable housing challenges. They should not be included in the comprehensive plan.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>As a more than 20 year Kirkland resident I am concerned about the direction Kirkland is going in. Changing the land use designation to mixed use for all neighborhoods will overburden our already crowded city. There are times in the day that I cannot get out of my driveway as it is. More people and more cars are not what I want. Please remove the transit corridor from the 2044 Comprehensive plan and keep our neighborhoods and their height limits intact</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>A resident west of Market... You responsibility is to serve the residents of the city of Kirkland, which of course includes some planning of how to accommodate future growth without destroying our existing neighborhoods..... Have you considered, and if so, what went into the decision not to integrate any of these options into the plan?</p> <p>1. Only upzoning for properties directly fronting on Market? And upzoning only adjacent to existing commercial and current multi-family, which would have less impact on what is now a single family neighborhood? And upzoning only along the major thoroughfares-Market, 116th, 124th, Central, Lk Wash. Blvd, etc. 2. Staged upzoning— with no additional upzoning until all high density is built out? Utilitizing only all the current increased density zoning before adding additional areas of significant density increases? Plan for building out the full capacity of existing high density zones before turning most of the city into a high-density-zoned community.</p> <p>Then staged in small increments vs a major community so that it does not destroy whole single family neighborhoods? This could push the negative impact on the neighborhoods into the next 20-year cycle, which would allow a significant majority of the properties to turn over and have a lesser impact on current homeowners?</p> <p>3. What other options were considered and why rejected? Please provide details.</p> <p>4. What has been the coordination/ commitment by METRO to provide frequent, flexible transit for future residents since it is being called a transit corridor? The current transit service along Market Street is sketchy at best, and any significant increase in residents who would be expected to use transit instead of single family cars, would need to be assured of frequent, flexible, 7-day-a-week transportation options that would enable them to reach their employment bases in communities throughout the greater Kirkland/Eastside/Seattle area. Is METRO willing to provide that service? Have they considered how to accommodate safe transit/crossing of Market Street for the students who need to cross to get to their schools? If the transit and parking/traffic issues have not been addressed, it is time to do so BEFORE the city is locked into a plan that does not have an answer to these issues....</p> <p>5. What is the plan for mitigating parking and traffic issues that would affect our streets and traffic patterns (such as lights to get out, parking requirements for any Multifamily? As it stands now, with the cottage housing that is increasing throughout the neighborhood, the streets are essentially one-car width, and our garbage service and other traffic has challenges navigating the streets. How much increased traffic/parking etc. is in the plan? How does the city plan to ensure the least impact so that the quality of life and safety of our children and families is protected?...</p> <p>It appears that the city is attempting to 'put one over' on residents as it states on the papers distributed at the Market Neighborhood meeting that the plan is NOT proposing increased density.....</p> <p>It is very disrespectful to your tax payers and Kirkland residents to try to implement a plan without directly reaching out to every household/property owner in the affected areas. Not every individual has access to proactively go to your website to see if there is anything they should take note of. I hope that you will reconsider the current proposal and return to the drawing board and come up with a viable proposal that respects your citizens, our neighborhoods, thoughtful growth and the fact that your role is to serve our community, not destroy it.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I appreciate Commissioner Rutherford sharing his response in a thoughtful document with additional videos and documents. It helped me understand his position and how he reached his decision. Despite my support for growth in Kirkland, the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan won't address many existing issues like traffic congestion, lac of public transportations, and I believe better alterntives are available. I am firmly against including the transit corridors in the 2044 Comp Plan. LU-2.4 should be removed.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am just hearing about the proposed land use changes. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Regarding LU-2.4: What is the definition of transit corridor and frequest transit corridor? Are these different? What are pioneer developments? What does dedicated funding mean? I have concerns about the proposed process for potential zoning code amendments. What is meant by dedicated funding? What does planned infrastructure mean?</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I support increasing the variety of middle housing options along transit corridors paired with a robust plan to increase public transit and safer active modes of transportation such as walking and biking.</p>
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am concerned about proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan. I live in Houghton. There is a lot of traffic making it difficult to get out of my driveway. The City brought up the land use proposal during the sleepy days of August without mailing out notices. We built a LEED score house....The City is proposing taking hundreds of millins of dollars of poerty value from existing homeowners and taxpayers in order to benefit dvelopers and hypothetical future residents. If the City wants more affordable housing the City should pay for it...</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. The status quo does not preclude extensive new development. The city already has great scope to build in existing mixed-use areas like (non-exhaustively) Totem Lake, Downtown, and the Station Area.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I currently live in Redmond near Avondale Rd but will be moving soon..... I did start my search for a place to live in the King County area but unfortunately was unable to afford to buy in Kirkland and had to buy a condo elsewhere.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. We are also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. We have residential zoning for a reason. We need to stick to planned development, such as is already being done in Totem Lake and at 85th. Plan and upgrade infrastructure first, then consider changes. We've already met our growth requirements. Cities can set up housing trusts, or reserve housing for people who already live or work in a city. Yes, support and prioritize our teachers, firemen, police, grocery store workers, etc. who work here and should be able to live here. Support our seniors and disabled on fixed incomes, who can't afford to stay in their homes without assistance--or selling to developers....No community has an obligation to create enough single person or other housing for everyone who wants to live there, nor can we...We don't have significant transit.... unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe. People who don't live here are attempting to influence how Kirkland builds its future. They say they want anyone to be able to afford to live anywhere, and they're willing to trample on the rights of those who already reside here. Development lobbyists and idealists are flying false flags of "affordable housing", when they're actually pirates, looking for land to build on. The market rate housing they want to build will not be affordable. The land it's on is too valuable on the "transit corridors" that have been designated. People who currently live in a city have rights, too.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	I'm a resident of the Totem Lake neighborhood off NE 116th St. I'm writing to voice my support of adding varied and dense housing, as well as mixed-use zoning along transit corridors in our city. I get around by foot, bike, scooter and public transit only, My electric cargo bike has been, without question, the best purchase of my life, and I encourage everyone I meet to buy one for themselves. I also tell people that an e-bike or scooter makes it possible to live in Kirkland without a car; I'm doing it every day. Mixed-use zoning provides a convenience of living that most people have never experienced and always want to return to when they don't have it. Essential services such as grocery stores, coffee shops and restaurants, become trivial to access without the need for a car. It allows small business owners to live close to their shops and employees to live close to their workplace. Mixed-use development removes a significant amount of stress and expense of starting a small business in the first place. I believe that building more varied housing and mixed-use areas near transit is the best way to make Kirkland a better place. This will attract new people, help local businesses, and reduce our reliance on cars. I hope the City Council will take this seriously and work towards a future where Kirkland is a great place to live.
8/22/2024	Land Use Changes	Planning Commissioners and City Council are committed to an agenda that will drastically impact Kirkland in negative ways. 2. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. 3. The intention to eliminate "Residential" land use designations. "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. 4. I ask that the Commission propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>From South Rose Hill Neighborhood Association Board:</p> <p>Designating NE 70th Street as a transit corridor within the updated Comprehensive Plan is misguided, and the designation should be removed. The South Rose Hill Bridle Trails neighborhood has been losing transit service steadily over the past 20 years despite the growth in residential and commercial development in the neighborhood. This is evidenced by the closure by Metro of the Houghton Park and-Ride lot due to lack of usage. This lack of usage was notably precipitated by the erosion in bus service along NE 70th Street.</p> <p>The idea in the Comprehensive Plan of adding land use density along this corridor with the hope that Metro would add more bus service is wishful thinking at best. Councilmember Pascal articulated this point well, since King County's criteria for allocating bus service hours puts Kirkland near the bottom given other priorities within the county.</p> <p>Current Route 245 ridership is very low apart from school hours. This route does not connect directly to major activity centers, requiring one or more transfers to access destinations such as downtown Bellevue and Seattle. The idea that more people living along NE 70th Street would become regular bus riders is very unlikely. Rather than adding NE 70th Street as a transit corridor, the city should work with Metro to provide bus service from our neighborhood to the upcoming BRT station on I-405/NE 85th Street.</p> <p>Rather, the city plans should focus on areas of the city that are currently designated for growth, notably downtown, Totem Lake, and NE 85th Street. Our neighborhood worked very hard with the city on the NE 85th Street Station Area plan with its land use and transportation components. As documented in the Comprehensive Plan SEIS, there is sufficient zoning capacity within these existing commercial centers to accommodate the expected city growth over the next 20 years. Should the city proceed with the proposed transit corridors, there must be specific provisions for more detailed environmental analysis along these corridors prior to the zoning process. We agree with Mr. Pascal that the draft SEIS is not detailed enough to distinguish key environmental issues that would likely occur along a corridor such as NE 70th Street with housing and employment growth exceeding 240 percent. For example, this level of land use growth could easily more than double the daily traffic volumes along NE 70th Street, a situation that was not disclosed in the SEIS. The city should invest in conducting these more detailed studies now, prior to making zoning decisions that are very difficult to change. While the Neighborhood Association supports appropriate growth, as shown by our participation in the NE 85th St. Station Area Plan, we feel that this movement toward densification of the NE 70th Street corridor is not supported by fact nor necessity at this time.</p>
8/21/2024	Land Use Changes	I support the Comprehensive Plan's including a set of guiding policies that allow for abundant and diverse housing, especially along frequent transit corridors.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Regarding: Road modification of Market Street &amp; 106th Ave NE to 4 to 6 Story Buildings in RS7200. Both of these ideas are poor at best. I will explain.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Road width increase will not help the neighborhoods, only encourage drivers of populated areas to the north onto Kirkland roads for access. This issue was discussed in about 1992 while I was on the Planning Commission on a transportation committee. Drivers from areas to the north wanted 4 lanes of travel to speed through Kirkland because the freeway was backed up. The backup will always occur during rush hours. Increasing the width of the road will only bring more traffic.</li> <li>2. Four to Six story buildings as apartments or condominiums may sound like an easy way to solve housing problems, but it comes with many unintended consequences. The choice of ¼ mile as many assumptions. Also, the choice of using transit corridors has many assumptions. Such as, that people will abandon their cars and walk. People living in Kirkland are mostly moderately affluent; they will own cars. I understand that Bothell, Kenmore, and Redmond have all chosen to put the apartment growth in their core, near services. Unintended consequences are many:             <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. If you use 5 story 60-foot building for an example; the house to the north will live in a shadow 6 months of the year.</li> <li>2. The 25-foot building code for single family residences is no longer enforceable. Kirkland will lose that battle in court.</li> <li>3. The suggestion of one or fewer parking spaces will lead to an overflow of on- street parking. This occurred after the development of a condominium project on 124th Ave NE north of NE 90th Street in the late 1980s. My son moved in the early 2000's with wife. She used the parking space, and he parked in front houses (along with many others) on the neighboring street. Neighbors were not happy.</li> <li>4. With this 5-story building up to ¼ mile from the road, you will have many more vehicle trips on side streets. While on the Planning Commission, we were informed that each occupancy unit has a minimum of 10 trips a day. If more than one car, maybe more trips. With the smaller side streets, the danger of pedestrian and bicycle injuries is greater. If this occurs, there will probably be liability for the City of Kirkland.</li> <li>5. By placing these buildings away services, the occupants will have to drive to the store, etc. to acquire the item they suddenly needed.</li> <li>6. The assumption that the bus service will satisfy all travel is incorrect. The 255 bus was removed from direct downtown to the "U" district. Metro wants you to transfer, people want direct service. I used to ride the 255 to Seattle, but not now. Metro has its own priorities, not Kirkland's.</li> <li>7. Kirkland cannot solve the area housing problem. The big Gorilla in the room is Seattle, and they have built no affordable low-income housing with over 100 million dollars of development fees. Kirkland construction is not affordable. A 3-unit cottage project near me will probably sell for \$3 million each.</li> <li>8. Finally, worst case scenario: Six story 72 foot 30 unit apartment about ¼ mile from Market with no parking required and 30 cars or more parked in the neighborhood driving the streets with 300 trips a day. When you pass rules, you must imagine all the variables.</li> </ol> </li> </ol> <p>Please proceed with the initial plan for building the core areas. Also note that placing tall buildings downtown has one major problem; it is a flood zone. Different rules and it did flood in December of 2006. Hopefully, I have the date correct.</p> <p>Thank you for your review and not placing 4 to 6 story buildings in neighborhoods.</p>
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>I am writing to express my concern and objection to the proposed density plan! Downtown Kirkland is losing its charm due to constant overbuilding and poor city planning.</p> <p>If the goal is to destroy Kirkland by 2044, then continuing on the current course will certainly achieve that.</p> <p>Downtown Kirkland is not Bellevue. It has only three main routes for access, and the resulting traffic congestion is unbearable, negatively impacting local businesses—a problem that has persisted for decades. The area is now filled with plastic surgery centers, hair and nail salons, and massage shops, which speaks volumes about the current culture.</p> <p>Kirkland used to be a quaint lakeside town with a vibrant restaurant and nightlife scene. Now, it seems the city lacks a clear identity or vision. It appears the City Council is confused as well.</p> <p>The constant overdevelopment has made living and working in Kirkland increasingly difficult. Kirkland Urban, for example, is a disastrous complex with failed promises. Variances granted to builders have led to overbuilding, as seen with the Wendy's property where Bartell Drugs once stood—another failed promise with more overdevelopment.</p> <p>How does this improve Kirkland? How is this sustainable?</p> <p>It seems the only priority is increasing tax revenue by approving these developments. The idea of creating affordable housing is undermined by granting variances that allow for six homes where only one or two would normally fit. This leads to crowded streets and frustrated drivers. These so-called "affordable" homes are then listed for over \$1.4 million—what a joke. Careful, the current boom is driven by high paying jobs in technology. If Google goes away (which it could), like Boeing was to Renton, this could cause a considerable problem for Kirkland. Also, technology and the advent of AI will have a significant impact to technology jobs by 2044. I don't feel this is being considered. Sounds like a disaster on many fronts.</p> <p>If the aim is to make Kirkland desirable and enjoyable, development must be slowed down and then evaluated again, the focus by 2044, should be on providing services that residents truly want and fixing the existing infrastructure.</p> <p>Consider looking at cities like Bend, Oregon, or Edmonds as more appropriate models, rather than trying to force Kirkland into something it is not.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes - Houghton	Three story high buildings max! Is the city buying property along 108th for transit access and additional lanes? Horrible design and usage. Traffic lights would be needed at every intersection to allow people to who live E and W to enter 108th. Clearly no one who is on the council or planning commission live in these areas. Has anyone considered parking? Most underground parking is very poor and unsafe. The impact on the school needs consideration. When is the city buying NW College? What is the city's agenda? Since the recent information is very late in being sent out this all seems irregular. From an unhappy resident of 47 years.....
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes - Houghton	Apparently this Thursday's meeting is going to get a lot of open comment. In the interest of sparing you yet another two minutes, I beg you not to adopt LU-2.4 as proposed. It shows ALL of Houghton as a transit corridor for consideration of higher density zoning. This is madness: we only have two lanes into our neighborhood and two lanes out (LW blvd and 108th) and those lanes are already so densely utilized that it's easier for residents out of our neighborhood to get groceries and soccer practices held in Bellevue. Increasing the density of our neighborhood will further alienate residents down here from the city of Kirkland, so you need to take the insane LU-2.4 proposal off the table. If LU-2.4 is adopted as proposed, then I am very confident there will be well organized challengers from our neighborhood running for every available city council seat next cycle.
7/8/2024	Land Use Changes - Houghton	The slow congested crawl of traffic has already become the norm in Houghton. Up and down 108th and 68th is a quagmire that must be acknowledged before the city starts planning higher density along this route. The roads cannot be widened so it's very concerning to residents.
7/7/2024	Land Use Changes - Houghton	Many of my neighbors are dismayed by the rampant growth in this neighborhood. Reasonable sized homes are torn down and mega homes are built in their place. The City must put measures that allow/require smaller single family homes to be built. Also, the thought of 5-story buildings packing into the area is heartbreaking. 3-story mixed use buildings seem reasonable to allow for both growth and appeal.
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>We are writing to express our strong opposition to the proposed densification plan for the Market Street corridor. We have lived – and raised our family - on 2nd Street, Kirkland, since 1984. We also built and occupied a small office building on Market Street for approximately 35 years (1986-2021). Based on our long-standing residence and business presence in this area, we have directly observed the significant changes that have taken place along the Market Street corridor over the past several decades.</p> <p>Market Street has over the last 30+ years transitioned from the site of individual homes, independent retailers, and small office buildings to a corridor dominated by two-story commercial office buildings and expensive townhouses/condominiums. This development has brought a commensurate increase in traffic volume along Market Street, which has become a major and heavily congested thoroughfare. Passenger vehicles and Metro buses traveling this route increasingly encounter delays and complete stops, particularly during commuting periods, due to high volumes and traffic signals at Forbes Creek and Juanita Drive. It is difficult, indeed dangerous, for pedestrians, often comprising older residents and families with young children, attempting to cross Market Street even with flashing lights or handheld flags.</p> <p>Any plan to further densify this area by permitting 4-6 story multi-housing units along Market Street would severely exacerbate the existing traffic problems. In our view, such a proposal would be short-sighted and disregard the significant negative consequences, both immediate and long term.</p> <p>Moreover, extending this densification plan to 2-3 adjacent streets on either side of Market Street would have a devastating impact on the surrounding residential communities. Increasing density in these areas would destroy views, lower property values, exacerbate existing traffic volumes, and subject residents to years of disruptive construction activity.</p> <p>While the stated goal of this plan may be to create "affordable housing," the reality is that the existing condominiums and townhouses in this area – many of which have been recently built or sold – demonstrate exceptionally high assessed valuations and sales prices. This casts serious doubt on the likelihood that any new development would result in truly affordable housing options.</p> <p>We join our neighbors and the thousands of signers of the Cherish Kirkland petition in firmly opposing this densification plan as it pertains to the Market Street corridor and surrounding neighborhoods. The negative consequences for our community far outweigh any imagined benefits. We urge you to reconsider this proposal and instead focus on preserving and enhancing the unique character and livability of Kirkland.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I would like to speak against the increased height along the Market street area. This area has been developing as multifamily with mostly 2 story heights as specified in the last comp plan. The current zoning has been a good response to increasing housing needs while reducing traffic impacts in the neighborhoods and access to transit.</p> <p>An increase in height to 6/8 stories would radically change the nature and character of the neighborhood. This kind of height can create wind tunnel corridors reducing pedestrian use of sidewalks, block sunlight for streets and surrounding neighborhoods, cut off views and create a patchwork of different heights until it is built out, which will be many decades as most of the new development is lower and won't be rebuilt for many years.</p> <p>By approving these height allowances, there will be increased pressure on the neighborhood to to increase multifamily and eliminate single family housing. It sets a precedent that locks in a development cycle for the future.</p> <p>This high density approach is utilized in many cities around the world, such as Paris. It assumes high density, multifamily, high rise neighborhoods without single family housing. The question is, is this the kind of city that we envision for Kirkland.</p> <p>Kirkland in the future may be entirely or mostly high rise buildings to accommodate growth, but that is more than 50 years out. The comp plan is designed for a 20 year horizon. I think that this proposal to increase height to 6/8 stories should be postponed to the next development cycle.</p> <p>I also think that the citizens of Kirkland should talk about this vision of the future.</p>
8/16/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I am writing to express my strong opposition to upzoning the Market Street Corridor, for multiple reasons.</p> <p>First, Market Street itself is not able to accommodate increased traffic as there is no feasible way to build dedicated transit lanes, and traffic is already backed up along the length of Market Street at 5 PM on weekdays. Adding greater density to this corridor would be disastrous for both auto and transit commute times. It would be naive to think that the residents of thousands of new units will not drive personal vehicles, as there is no quick, convenient transit on Market Corridor and transit cannot be easily expanded on this street.</p> <p>Second, street parking in both Market Neighborhood and Norkirk is already overburdened (try parking near Heritage Park on the weekend) and adding thousands of new units along this corridor would turn parking into something akin to Capitol Hill on Seattle. Why would Kirkland want that? Why would Kirkland want working parents to circle around the neighborhood looking for parking to take their groceries and children home after a long day?</p> <p>Third, WSDOT and Sound Transit are specifically investing in I-405 as the North-South transit route through Kirkland. Destroying the character of historic Kirkland neighborhoods (Market and Norkirk) in an attempt to turn Market Street into a transit corridor is terribly misguided. Market Street can never be a high-volume transit corridor. It cannot be expanded and vehicle traffic cannot be easily diverted.</p> <p>Increasing density on the Market Street Corridor is something that looks good on paper unless you actually live in Kirkland. If you live in Kirkland, and live near Market, it's rather obvious that this is a terrible idea for the reasons stated above.</p>
7/25/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I live, work, and am raising a family in Norkirk. I support the proposed revisions to encourage increased density and decreased parking requirements in the Norkirk community plan and the Market St corridor. Our community will benefit from increased housing availability, commercial activity, and related services driven by that growth.</p>
7/24/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I am opposed to the aggressive plans for the new transit corridors. I understand a growth plan is required by the State, but what the Planning Commission is proposing misses the mark. Allowing high density in too many neighborhoods without the infrastructure of road capacity and mass transit will create more gridlock and frustration. Allowing 50-200 units per acre will take away the trees, day light and views from the current residents of Kirkland.</p> <p>Be respectful of the existing neighborhoods and create density targets that does not detract from them. Keep high density close to I-405 where there are more bus options.</p> <p>Market Street is already a highway and difficult to turn left onto or walk across even while holding a crossing flag (thank you for these!). Adding increased density to any of the roads far from I-405 will create additional safety hazards.</p> <p>We are expecting older homes in our area to be redeveloped but with existing height limits. We would lose our view of the sky if heights were increased both along Market and ¼ mile into the neighborhood and decrease our property value.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/20/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>We are writing to express our concerns about the enormous changes proposed on the K2044 densification plan for Kirkland - the densification of Kirkland's major transit corridors, +/- 1/4 mile which includes a majority of Kirkland. We have just recently become aware of the project from a neighbor. We realize there are many downsides to it, especially for the residents affected. We are especially disappointed learning of the project so late as we don't regularly read the Kirkland government websites and you have made no attempt (to my knowledge) to publicly post this information - shame on you! There are many ways you could have publicly informed us about this in time for us to respond - which you chose not to do. We are current residents of Kirkland who will be negatively affected by you K2044 Comprehensive Plan, specifically the plan to density the Market Street Corridor. Our beautiful lake views will disappear, traffic and noise will increase, available parking spaces will decrease. There are physical and mental health implications of stress from reduced living space, less green space, increased traffic congestion and concentration of air pollution in densely populated areas, loss of access to public amenities (crowded public spaces), increased land and housing prices in select areas, increased lack of privacy, increased exposure to noise as well as negative environmental impacts arising from increased energy demand, changes to microclimates and reduced green spaces and unsealed surfaces to name a few. Please avail yourselves of the study and research of densification provided at the end of this letter. I hope you will reconsider this project and reject the recommendations.</p>
7/17/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I am writing about the proposed density/intensity changes "deep" into single family neighborhoods. I am a little surprised that the proposed changes, especially along Market, have got this far. I know the increased density, several blocks into the west and east of Market neighborhoods is not supported by the neighborhoods. I would also say it is not necessary and it would not achieve the objective of affordable housing. We have seen at least 4 multi-unit projects go in west and east of market recently replacing single family homes. In every case, the individual units are over \$1.5 million, hardly affordable housing! Also, there are many areas/approaches that don't seem to have been considered, locations that are already more developed.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Increase multi-unit housing west of 6th on 7th avenue.</li> <li>2. Increase along 120th avenue and near there on 112th and 116th street</li> <li>3. Increase along Kirkland Avenue</li> <li>4. Increase along 6th street and State street</li> <li>5. Increase along 130th Ave Ne</li> <li>6. Increase along NE 68th Street</li> <li>7 Increases in any area that currently is mixed use</li> <li>8. Increasing the height in current multi-unit areas</li> <li>9. Increasing density and depth along Slater and 124 Street. If all these areas are considered, it wouldn't be necessary to change the zoning deep (i.e. 1/4 mile) into single family neighborhoods. Another related comment is about public bus transport. There is very little ridership now. In fact, I see some buses go by that are empty! It is too idealistic to believe that people will not drive their cars from apartments and condominiums. I worked for the State Land Use Planning Commission once upon a time and I know that staff can sometimes focus too much on their own beliefs and ideas. Please actively engage the neighborhoods that are going to be impacted by proposed changes.</li> </ol>
7/16/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>Why I feel adding significant housing density along Market Street is not a good idea at this time: The proposal to increase housing density in the market st corridor by constructing 4+ story buildings raises several concerns. 1.) Traffic congestion: the market st corridor is already experiencing substantial traffic congestion. Increasing housing density would exacerbate this issue by adding more vehicles to the roads. The additional residents would mean more cars. The current infrastructure is not equipped to handle the influx of vehicles that would accompany high density housing, resulting in gridlock. 2.) Safety concerns: higher housing density often correlates with increased pedestrian and vehicle interactions, raising safety concerns. The current road design and traffic control measures might not be sufficient to manage the increased traffic flow safely. This could lead to a higher incidence of traffic accidents and pose a risk to pedestrians. Additionally, emergency services might face delays navigating through more congested streets. 3.) Street parking issues: Street parking in the market st corridor is already limited and the addition of high density housing would further strain this resource. Residents of the new buildings would likely own cars, and without adequate off street parking, they would compete for the already scarce parking. This would inconvenience current residents, visitors, and local businesses. 4.) Inadequate infrastructure for tall buildings: the infrastructure in the market street corridor is not designed to support the demands of 4+ story buildings. Higher buildings require more robust utility systems, including water, sewage, and electrical services. The existing infrastructure may not be capable of handling the increased load, leading to potential service disruptions and the need for costly upgrades. Additionally, taller buildings would impact the aesthetic and character of the neighborhood, potentially overshadowing smaller, historic structures and altering the community's identity. 5.) Impact on community character and livability: the character of the market st corridor is defined by its current scale and density. Introducing taller, high density buildings would alter the visual and social fabric of the area. 6.) Incompatibility with existing structures: the proposed 4+ story buildings are out of character with the existing structures in the corridor. The downtown core area is a more appropriate location for these size structures, as it is already developed to accomodate higher density and taller buildings. 7.) Limited affordability: In practice, only a small percentage of the units in the proposed higher density structures are likely to be affordable. Given the desirable location, the majority of units will be very expensive. Sacrificing the character of the market st corridor for a few more "affordable units" is not a reasonable tradeoff.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>The purpose of this letter is to state, in the strongest terms, my objection to lining Market Street with 6 story buildings running a quarter of a mile deep on either side. This described development would ruin the lovely feel of Kirkland, block view planes for homeowners and pedestrians and dramatically increase the heavy traffic use that Market Street already experiences.</p> <p>My husband and I have been homeowners in Kirkland for over 30 years. One by one we've seen almost every charming, smaller home give way to large new homes. Over the past 3 decades numerous apartment homes and condominiums have been built all around the city. The downtown feel of Kirkland changed with the enormous Kirkland Urban development. Traffic has gotten worse and worse over the years. The traffic noise on Market Street already causes us to close our windows to manage the din.</p> <p>Let the record show that I, another Kirkland resident, oppose this development proposal. Do not let this happen on your watch. Do not leave this as your legacy. Do not permit the further crowding of our city. You have an opportunity to be heros in this community by stopping this proposal.</p>
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>We have been homeowners in the Norkirk neighborhood since 1984. We raised our two daughters here. We became involved in Kirkland American Little League and helped bring the Little League Junior Softball World Series to this City. We have been absolutely appalled by the senseless, headlong movement towards increased density far beyond any mandated growth management plan in recent decades. We fought the movement to allow increased density in Norkirk for years while Eric Shields was head of Kirkland Planning. We opposed the City's movement to dilute minimum lot sizes tooth and nail.</p> <p>This latest proposal to allow up to six story apartments along Market Street is the last straw. This is madness. You are turning this city into a Bellevue or worse, Seattle. That is not at all where we chose to live. We are ashamed of what the City of Kirkland council and commission are doing to ruin this once lovely city. We have made the decision to sell our home and move away from the City we once loved and to which we devoted so much energy.</p>
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>My spouse and I have been homeowners in the Norkirk neighborhood since 1988. We raised our two children here, and plan to remain Kirkland residents for the rest of our lives.</p> <p>We are appalled by the ill-advised, senseless, headlong movement towards increased density and increased building heights along Market Street. The plan goes far beyond any mandated growth management plan in recent decades. The entire proposal to allow up to six story apartments along Market Street is a horrible idea, and only serves the interests of people trying to maximize the own financial gains at the expense of our neighborhood's livability.</p> <p>The plan would *further* turn Kirkland into a corridor for yet more heavy traffic passing through the center of our lovely town, and would create major congestion in every way. Are we as a community just "giving up" on keeping traffic and congestion in check, and turning Kirkland into Lake City Way? We join many of our neighbors in speaking strongly against the new plan, and urge you to reconsider.</p>
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>I am writing to voice strong opposition to higher density along market street. As resident of Kirkland for 42 years, I have seen Kirkland grow to a wonderful vibrant community, keeping its small town charm. We must protect our residential corridors from further increased traffic, congestion and loss of its appeal. Please take note of groundswell opposition to this change.</p>
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>We want to register our absolute opposition to the proposal to allow greatly increased housing density and up to 6-story apartment/condo buildings within a quarter mile east and west of market street. My wife and I have been Kirkland residents for 40 years and have raised our two kids here. Our home is in the Norkirk neighborhood and we plan to remain here indefinitely. We recognize the long-term economic and social and environmental land use benefits of concentrating density of housing and businesses in some zones of the Kirkland-Bellevue urban area. We supported the redevelopment of Totem Lake, and the Kirkland urbana complex. But there are areas where density and redevelopment makes obvious sense - areas along existing major multi lane traffic arteries with easy entrances and exits to I-405, areas that are not predominantly suburban single-family residential neighborhoods. The proposal to allow large multi-story apartments and significantly increased density east and west of market st does not make sense and approaches the level of "insanity". Rapid development over the past 10 years, even in those focused zones such as Totem Lake, has still come at a cost; significantly increasing noise and traffic congestion in the downtown area, decreasing livability of neighborhoods a considerable distance away. It seems reasonable to allow limited density increase and taller apartments (3 to 4 story) within a block of Market St as a more realistic natural progression of "progress". In order to maintain the historic suburban character that drew many to live and work in Kirkland over the past 50 years, the City needs to strike a balance between economic development, housing density, transportation, and maintaining the unique Kirkland feel.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>As a Kirkland resident and homeowner, I want to express my strong support for changes to allow for much more density and much more rapid growth with a focus on decreasing car dependency. This included proposed changes along market street which I believe represent a bare minimum. Kirkland should increase height caps, increase units per acre, remove all minimum parking requirements city wide.</p>
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>Market street resident concerned about the proposed changes to height limits and density in the neighborhood. Specific concerns: Preservation of neighborhood character - increasing the height limit risks altering the skyline and aesthetic appeal of Market St. Traffic and parking. Environmental impact - increased density and construction could lead to more pollution, affecting local air and water quality. Infrastructure strain - higher population density could strain existing infrastructure, potentially leading to a decline in service quality and increased cost for residents. Green spaces - the development could reduce green spaces and parks. Noise pollution - taller buildings and more residents could lead to increased noise levels. Community engagement - residents must have a voice in shaping the future of the neighborhood.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Market neighborhood resident opposed to the proposed changes to height limits and density in the neighborhood. Increasing height limits risks altering the skyline and aesthetic appeal of Market St. Higher density development often lead to increased traffic congestion and parking challenges. I believe that meaningful community engagement is essential in shaping the future of our neighborhood. Residents like myself should have a voice and be actively involved in decisions that impact our community's future.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	West of Market resident that is in shock about the plan to rezone the neighborhood. Issues include privacy problems, no parking for new high density buildings, traffic congestion. Put density where it makes sense.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	West of Market resident that is concerned with traffic congestion with no easy ingress and egress for WoM residents. The notion that new residents will take the bus is misguided. Can we please revisit the zoning changes and pause until there is further study and a chance for us residents to have input.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Against land use changes in the Market Street neighborhood. The traffic alone will create unsafe conditions for walking and children playing in the area. It will also chsnge the feel of Kirkland. There are existing areas in Totem Lake and Par Mac where you could increase the height and FAR if you're trying to increase housing.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Market Street resident concerned about the proposed changes to height limits and density around transit corridors, specifically the potential for allowing buildings up to five stories high on Market Street.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Against the land use changes in the Market Street neighborhood and am concerned by the lack of awareness among most of the impacted residents.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Have you considered the impact to the neighborhood, community, heritage, and environment of the proposed change? We want Kirkland to grow as well, but is there another way than adding a bunch of 5 story buildings on Market Street?
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Market resident that moved to Kirkland from Seattle because we value the small community feel and single-family neighborhoods. We're very concerned with the plan to change zoning 1/4 mile off of Market to increase density. There are many areas in Kirkland that are already zoned for higher density that make more sense for adding units and have more capacity.
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	West of market residents that do not support so much planned growth in this area of Kirkland off of market St without more infrastructure in place. Does not seem like the housing would have parking either so would spill into streets.
6/20/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	Strongly support the upzoning proposal along the Market St transportation corridor, in which my new house is located. I believe the increased transit and density options will make the lifestyle I now enjoy more accessible and benefit Kirkland overall, reducing traffic, and providing more service options within walking distance.
5/22/2024	Land Use Changes - Market Neighborhood	<p>The current zoning code and building permit approval processes are causing a serious public safety problem in our neighborhood. Residents are at risk of dying and houses are at risk of burning down. This safety issue exists under current code and the increased density described in the new Comprehensive Plan will make it worse. I am all in favor of building more housing to accommodate growth, but we are doing it wrong, at least in our neighborhood (Market).</p> <p>With increasing frequency, vehicles are blocked from driving on our streets.</p> <p>Multiple times I have watched the school bus back down the hill near me for almost 1/4 mile, back that long bus into an uncontrolled intersection, turn around, and seek another route.</p> <p>The waste management trucks face the same fate. If an EMT or fire truck encounters that blockage, the result will be tragic.</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.New construction is making the streets more narrow. Builders remove the gravel parking strips along the street and push the curbs out into the street.</li> <li>2.On-street parking is exploding because of increased density, reduced off-street parking requirements, and smaller driveways.</li> </ol> <p>This Comp Plan's bold vision for increased density needs to include bold infrastructure plans to handle the growth.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes and public transit	<p>To reduce the public's uncertainty surrounding the draft comp plan, including the K-line Metro route, I suggest:</p> <p>The PC include in the draft language direction to CC to guide staff to increase the collaboration with Metro regarding the K-line. After which, the city and Metro would sign a joint Memorandum Of Understanding (MOU) of the plan. Over the years, as city and Metro officials move on, we will have a document in the file regarding this important topic. I am hearing great concern that the city will upzone and the K-line will not happen. Leaving the city with the worst-case scenario, more density, and more traffic with no new bus lines.</p>



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes- Norkirk Neighborhood	<p>I just became aware of a proposal to allow up to 6 story apartment/Condo buildings in the Norkirk Neighborhood. To let you know, I WAS SHOCKED. How could the planning commission want to destroy our neighborhood. Its so sad that Kirkland is so quickly going away as a quiet, nice and safe community to live in and raise a family. But now, its corporate greed from City planners and builders to jam as many people in a small space as could be. My wife and I have live in our house on 2nd and 15th since 1980, and raised our kids here. It was a close knit neighborhood where you knew your neighbor and we shared so much. Now, they are tearing down a house and shoving 3, 4 or 5 little houses. When we remodeled in the past, we took down an old dying tree, but the city required us to replace it with 3 trees. Now, we see lots with trees and shrubs just torn up so you can put more housing up. Guess, climate change with tearing down greenery is not in your vision.</p> <p>Please, don't destroy Norkirk. Once you crowd so much in, there is no turning back. I want to cry every time I drive through downtown Redmond and see all of those VERY TALL 6 STORY BUILDINGS. It looks like a dark tunnel. No sun, no view of the sky and no view of Beautiful downtown Redmond. If that is progress, then I want to get back into a Time Machine.</p> <p>I know there is always need for housing and space is limited, but no need to destroy what many Kirkland citizens build up in the past. Appreciate you considering my concerns.</p>
8/23/2024	Land Use Changes - Process	<p>*Between 6:30 and 7 pm I am certain there were close to 300 people at city hall. It's inexcusable that the city staff did not prepare for a larger audience with more seating in and outside the chamber. No, people did not want to go downstairs. They wanted you to know they showed up, they care and that they were watching. There should have been a greater effort to get some of the younger men in the chamber to give up their chairs for the elderly and someone should have brought more chairs in. Not starting public comment for 40 minutes was a drag given the obvious interests of the crowd. Alternating a Pro and Con should be considered in the future and organizations like Livable Kirkland, Cherish Kirkland, Eastside 4. All should have no more than 3 speakers to allow more organic public comment to flourish. Fundamentally, the current densification plan in residential neighborhoods and more extremely, the transit-oriented corridors plan being proposed will succeed in providing more housing options, higher property values for all landowners, more expensive inventory to benefit realtors and high wage earners while dramatically increasing tax revenues to the City of Kirkland on the backs of current owners and renters. What densification in Kirkland will not do is create more affordable housing for anyone at middle and lower levels of income. A win for the City coffers and more high-income earners but, not so much for those who are trying to stay in their home or rental or those who would like to newly rent or own in Kirkland because the increased zoning drives up the property value even more than it is rising organically. This proposal and strategy does not solve affordable housing at all. Maybe affordable housing is just window dressing to increase tax revenue to the city.</p> <p>What is affordable to rent or own? Older homes and older apartments. Units that are subsidized by the government through taxpayers. Driving up zoning will increase turnover of these older properties to mostly developers who will create new inventory with much, much higher price tags and smaller footprints due to the price of the property and the high cost of building. What about seniors downsizing in Kirkland? They don't want a new 3 story anything at over 1 million dollars. Has it ever occurred to you that for many, Kirkland is where they came for more affordable housing? It's a better value than West Bellevue with arguably better schools and amenities. Can you imagine people from Kirkland going to planning commission and city council meetings in Clyde Hill, Medina or Hunts Point asking for affordable housing because it's much nicer there and we deserve to live there too? No, you can't. It would be a Saturday Night Live skit and yet, this is LITERALLY what we were listening to together on Thursday and were supposed to take it seriously. Further, what if I, as a Kirkland resident, started showing up in Woodinville, Redmond and Issaquah telling their planning commission what they should be doing? That is literally what some on the commission and city council are encouraging to artificially reinforce their ideology over the opinions of Kirkland residents who they are supposed to prioritize and represent. I think the planning commission needs to do some soul searching, use critical thinking and possibly consult outside, unbiased, experts. The city planning employees may be well intended but, it does not present as such when ill-conceived plans like this and the relevant process for updating neighborhood plans are hurried, dismissive of neighborhood input and any feeling that taxpayers should be fully notified or have a role in the creation process.</p> <p>These corridor plans/policies are not "thoughtful or well-reasoned." In fact, they seem haphazard and careless, would further gridlock the city and overburden emergency services and all infrastructure. We are counting on YOU to push back and NOT hustle this through. Please fully reject LU 2.4 on the grounds the policy does not show evidence that the corridors will create affordable housing and that this type of zoning will cause financial harm to existing renters and owners in Kirkland while enriching City coffers which seems anything but benevolent.</p>
8/20/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I, along with my husband, am a resident of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>4 to 6 story buildings as apartments or condos may sound like an easy way to solve housing problems but it comes with many unintended consequences. The choice of 1/4 mile has many assumptions. Also, the choice of using transit corridors has many assumptions. Such as, that people will abandon their cars and walk. People living in Kirkland are mostly moderately affluent; they will own cars. I understand that Bothell, Kenmore, and Redmond have all chosen to put the apartment growth in their core, near services. Unintended consequences are many: 1. If you use 5 story 60-foot building as an example, the house to the north will live in a shadow 6 months of the year. 2. The 25-foot building code for single family residence is no longer enforceable. Kirkland will lost that battle in court. 3. The suggestion of one or fewer parking spaces will lead to an overflow of on-street parking. This occurred after the development of a condo project on 124th ave NE north of 90th St in the late 1980s. My son moved in the early 2000's with his wife. She used the parking space, and parked in front housing (along with many others) on the neighboring street. Neighbors were not happy. 4. With this 5-story building up to 1/4 mile from the road, you will have many more vehicle trips on side streets. While on the Planning Commission, we were informed that each occupancy unit has a minimum of 10 trips per day. If more than one car, maybe more trips. With the smaller side streets, the danger of pedestrian and cyclist injuries is greater. If this occurs it will probably be a liability for the city. 5. By placing these buildings away from services, the occupants will have to drive to the store etc. 6. The assumption that the bus service will satisfy all travel is incorrect. The 255 bus was removed from direct downtown to the U district. Metro wants you to transfer but people want direct service. 7. Kirkland cannot solve the area housing problem. The big gorilla in the room is Seattle, and they have built no affordable low income housing with over 100 million dollars of development fees. Kirkland construction is not affordable. 8. Finally, 6 story 72 foot 30 unit apartments about 1/4 mile from market with no parking required and 30 cars or more parked in the neighborhood driving the streets with 300 trips per day. Please proceed with the initial plan for building the core areas. Also note that placing tall buildings downtown has one major problem; it is a flood zone.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I have lived with my wife and children for 15 years in Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. The city is already enabling for-profit developers to build high ROI mix-use buildings in Kirkland. We have empty apartments in Vela, which charge up to \$9k/mo in rent. Urban is empty on the upper floors for retail. Urban 2 is empty. The mixed-use buildings below Vela (old Hector's) are empty. The old PCC building is losing money each month. Why do we think that we can trust developers to not maximize ROI? Why can't the city enforce developers to lower vacancies or fine owners? Also, these people that rent these expensive apts drive cars, not walk or bike. The city allowed Google to move here and that pushed up living prices, and now the only people that are buying new homes are investors that rent on Airbnb for profit. The city can't enforce short term renters; why do we think that developers will have nothing but profits in mind?</p> <p>I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I have lived in Kirkland for the past 26 years. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I, along with my husband and children, are residents of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I love the idea of focusing on 2 or 3 areas (e.g. Totem Lake Village, Juanita Village, Houghton, ...) where the city can enable a ton of dense housing, a ton of infrastructure, and a ton of support services for that housing. "Spreading the pain" across all neighborhoods seems like the wrong approach. You can't make the entirety of Kirkland a "10 minute city". Pick some targets and focus. Enable awesome transit solutions (a variety, highly available, highly reliable, very low-cost/free) in and out of those hubs so that folks can choose to live further away. And while you're at it, encourage the kinds of goods and services in those areas such that people can live there without a car. I'm very concerned that potential future residents are being prioritized over current residents. Some of the implementation details in the plan will negatively impact some aspects of Kirkland that make it such a great place to live. Here are two examples:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Transit corridors through North Rose Hill. The plan shows that 124th Ave NE between 85th street and 124th street will become a "transit corridor". I think it's clear that existing home owners in North Rose Hill will be negatively impacted by the increased traffic and replacement of single family neighborhood homes with apartments. What's not clear to me is why the city would choose to invest this way when there's already a much bigger "transit corridor" just a few hundred yards away. I405 is already there, and it's already getting massive upgrades to improve capacity, throughput, accessibility, and public transportation. Why would the city attempt to duplicate this just a few hundred yards away? Especially given the dollar costs, but also the "quality of life" costs to the existing neighborhoods.</li> <li>2. Routing commuter traffic through our neighborhoods. By increasing traffic capacity (more lanes, higher speed limits) through our neighborhoods, the city is encouraging commuters to "short cut" on our streets. The city could choose to discourage this behavior and instead route traffic to i405, but that's not happening, and the K2044 plan makes this even worse than it already is. I invite members of the planning commission to visit this stretch of 124th Ave NE at 5pm on a Wednesday afternoon. You'll see mile-long line of standing traffic as commuters avoid i405 and cut through our neighborhood instead. It's not clear at all why the city is choosing this strategy.</li> </ol>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I, a longtime resident of Kirkland along with my husband and 2 young children, am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I am writing because we are firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As such, we ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. We appreciate that the City Staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft of the Land Use Element. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain.</p> <p>We are also concerned that this plan update eliminates "Residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "Residential Mixed Use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential Mixed-Use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of Residential zones would be lost, such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones, so this is concerning. We strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose an amendment to the Land Use Element removing transit corridors and Policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I, along with my husband and children, are residents of Kirkland. I am firmly against the inclusion of the transit corridors in the 2044 comprehensive plan. As such, I ask for all of Policy LU-2.4 and associated items to be removed. I appreciate that the city staff has included a new framework for transit corridors in the recent draft. The framework, however, is vague and the fundamental issues with the transit corridors remain. I am also concerned that this plan eliminates "residential" land use designations. Changing all these areas to "residential mixed use" is a significant change for Kirkland neighborhoods. Residential mixed-use allows small-scale commercial, institutional, and semi-public uses in residential neighborhoods. The plan does not specify what other features of residential zones would be lost such as setbacks and buffers between residential and commercial zones. I strongly urge the Planning Commission to propose and amendments to the land use element removing transit corridors and policy LU-2.4 from the 2044 comprehensive plan.</p>
8/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I'm writing in support of land use policies that allow increased density near frequent transit routes. It seems to me that a comprehensive plan, of all things, should be designed with the future in mind. Plans should be expected to have policies that seem uncomfortable for some now, but that clearly support future goals. Because of this, plans always come under fire from those who feel that things were better in the past or that are afraid their current interests won't be met in the future. It's understandable, but it's not good basis for planning. Over the past few years, I've noticed that there are a lot more people on the causeway at Juanita Bay Park. Sometimes I think, "Gee, I wish I was the only one out here like in the good old days." But I also think "well, there are more people here enjoying the park and it's really not hurting me, and after all, what do you expect, this is a great place." I think this second kind of thought is the type of thinking on which the plan should be built. It's not necessarily natural or easy, but it makes the most sense given what should be accomplished with a comprehensive plan.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/18/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>The City's 6th street corridor study completed in December 2017 shows that the corridor has significant congestion and transportation safety issues without extensive new development. Now the city wants to add more development traffic in addition to that proposed houghton village (old PCC) site? Higher density would be allowed 1/4 mile east and west of 108th, noting that people can access transit, such as the future K line. Metro's rapid ride (K line) proposes stops every 1/2 mile. If you live 1/4 east or west of 108th ave midway between two stops, at a minimum, you must walk 1/2 mile to access transit. People may drive and park on side streets near 108th, like they did when the south Kirkland park &amp; ride lot was being redeveloped. That was a real mess with people parking too close to the intersections at NE 60th &amp; NE 62nd, as well as encroaching on driveways. The higher density plan calls for limited on-site parking, resulting in more on street parking and possible conflicts with pedestrians and cyclists. There has been no discussion of any transit service along 108th except for the K line. Will there be any access for people that can't walk as far as 1/2 mile to access a bus stop? The transit queue jump lanes, as identified in the 6th street corridor study are for northbound transit at 60th &amp; 68th St. That was the most that could be accomplished without widening 108th ave to five lanes. It sounds like Metro would like full lanes from 53rd St to 68th St in both directions. If that is the case, why wasn't that noted in the corridor study - seems like bait and switch. Widening 108th to five lanes would be very costly, will change the character of the main street serving Houghton, and wasn't ever part of the city's transportation, neighborhood, or comprehensive plan process. The wider street will also increase crossing distances for pedestrians and will encourage higher traffic speeds, impacting safety. A study paid for by the city taxpayers, identified the types and level of land uses (and traffic generated) with redevelopment of the houghton village. The city council didn't like the results when they adopted that plan, so they decide, maybe we should buy it and start over and hell with the people that participated in that process. We bought it, now we should figure out what to do with it - instead of, here is what we heard from the community and working towards solutions to help make that happen, with a lot less than \$14 million and another almost \$1 million to renovate the PCC building for interim use for studio east. Oops, did that even come across your collective minds? Spend and then decide - kind of like the Houghton park and ride - we'll build a pool and community complex (but the voters said NO, what shall we do?). Let's look at things that will serve the broader community instead of serving as a neighborhood commercial center focused on providing goods and services within walking distance of the surrounding neighborhoods. We are now talking about bringing in more traffic for people throughout the city and surrounding community than envisioned in the HENC plan. For what purpose? The adjacent neighborhoods need to get in their cars to access reasonably priced groceries, go to a restaurant that serves more than sub sandwiches, teriyaki or other take out. How is that consistent with city policies to reduce transportation. Of course, we could all ride the K line, after walking as far as we should be able to in our own neighborhood.</p>
8/18/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I live in Kirkland (in the NE 85th St station area), work in Kirkland, and am on the board for Highlands neighborhood association (speaking here in my personal capacity). I support the proposal to study increased density within 1/4 mile of transit stations. We are in housing and housing affordability crisis, and we need to consider all possible tools to let the benefits of living in the wonderful place that is Kirkland extend to as many people as possible.</p>
8/18/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>Please approve the "transit corridor" land use designation. We need more housing and more transit. It makes sense to cluster housing along transit corridors.</p>
8/7/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>The comment letter presents several questions for the City to consider related to the economics and real estate market potential outcomes of policy changes and rezoning, supply and demand for producing affordable housing. Careful to eliminate parking requirements; many people need cars and cannot take transit. The commenter suggests the City hire an independent consultant who can advise you about supply and demand and what the impacts would be for housing supply should you do this, and the impacts on existing property owners such as I've noted above. You cannot assume facts that are not in evidence, nor can you support a hoped-for outcome without considering all possible unintended consequences.</p>
8/7/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>I support proposed Land Use Element Policy LU-2.4 and the transit corridor overlay even before STRIDE and RapidRide K transit service is implemented. Housing near transit allows for residents to take fewer car trips, and justifies future transit service. Denser housing projects are more efficient in terms of construction costs, infrastructure costs, and energy efficiency. Increasing density will affect demand for city services and facilities, but the city already has policies governing how to manage concurrency. This Land Use Policy is just the first step in the city's evaluation of increasing capacity near transit corridors. We must leave all options on the table so that the implementation program can study them and determine what the best route forward is to meet all of the city's goals.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/6/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>1.Opposed to Draft Policy LU-2.4 to create additional capacity for "higher-intensity" residential uses along numerous transit corridors. It will change the quality an character of the city for present and future generations</p> <p>2.We do NOT need to designate large swaths of rezoned corridors across the city which are proposed to be 1/4 mile each side in width and would impact many of our established communities including east and west of Market Street, east and west of 100th Ave, and other locations.</p> <p>3.City should identify places where higher density housing and major mixed use development would be appropriate</p> <p>4.No need to increase additional housing capacity to meet our mandated growth requirements.</p> <p>5.I support the following changes should be made to the Comprehensive Plan/regulations:</p> <p>a.Allowing some flexibility in residential building height where pitched roofs vs. flat roofs would help site drainage and structure appearance; reduce flat roof box</p> <p>b.Attention to parking requirements- do not eliminate them</p> <p>c.City should reate additional parks and open space to serve its growing population; provide shade; reduce temperatures</p> <p>d.Encourage existing strip mall sites to redevelop with mixed use and housing above commercial on the ground floor</p>
8/5/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Opposed to density increases along NE 116th ST transit corridor. Growth should occur in areas of city already zoned for commercial and has the infrstructure to suppor it.
7/26/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Opposed to density increases along transit corridors
7/19/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	I am in favor of increased density in Kirkland along transit corridors. Increased density helps bring property prices down and to give more people an opportunity to enjoy all that is wonderful about Kirkland.
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Current zoning allows Kirkland to meet most of its objectives for housing growth. There is no need to upzone a huge swath of the Bridle Trails-South Rose Hill neighborhood as a designated transit corridor.
7/12/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>While I believe that Kirkland and other municipalities need to evolve, the proposed zoning changes around current transit corridors require much more study and public debate.</p> <p>If enacted, the changes will affect thousands of current Kirkland citizens, impacting property values, traffic patterns, view corridors, and livability.</p> <p>The Planning Commission has an obligation to the citizens of Kirkland to fully communicate the expected impact of the zoning changes, and I don't believe the Commission or the City has done this. The outcry you are hearing right now is proof that the communication of the proposed changes has been inadequate.</p> <p>I ask the Planning Commission to slow down, better communicate the options and alternatives, derive more feedback from the citizenry, and not bow to the demands of developers who want a quick buck.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Market resident opposed to increased density land use changes along Market Street transit corridor
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	I have just heard that the city are considering increasing housing in the area to 5 stories. This is utterly ridiculous and only benefits the greedy. We live on 16th Avenue at 167 - we are already losing most of our Seattle lake view with the 3 hideous homes being squeezed into the one home plot by our home, which will impact its value. We completely disagree with this proposal. Don't change this beautiful beach town into a chaotic town with no space for parking, even worse traffic congestion with the current issues surrounding the insane 405 changes and other large housing projects in Kirkland - it's already bulging at the seams.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	I live in the Market St Neighborhood. I am sickened by the plan to allow 5 story buildings not only along Market St, but within a .25 mile span. 1st St in particular is a much-loved neighborhood walking street due it's gorgeous lake views that pedestrians can enjoy. Families from across the city come to the Tot Lot park to enjoy the views it offers. This is what makes Norkirk special. Additionally, we already are challenged by traffic. The density plan with reduced parking plans would make traffic safety worse by having cars fighting for parking spaces. In connection with the Comprehensive Plan update, I urge you to reconsider proposed density increases in neighborhoods that already have infrastructure and traffic safety challenges. I am against the proposed Transit Corridors and accompanying density increases. We do not want to ruin what makes our neighborhood special and are against plans that would exceed the housing growth requirements for 2044.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	I live in the Market Neighborhood with my husband and 16 month old son. We moved to Kirkland a little over a year ago (from Seattle) to enjoy a more neighborhood feel and less busy environment to raise our son. The vision of him riding his bike through the neighborhood was a big draw to the West of Market area. In connection with the Comprehensive Plan update, I urge you to reconsider proposed density increases in neighborhoods that already have infrastructure and traffic challenges. While growth is expected, this extreme density growth plan is short-sided and ruins the charm of Kirkland. Therefore, I am against the proposed Transit Corridor and accompanying density increased along Market Street.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Thanks for serving but do what you can to keep Kirkland as livable and lovable as possible.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	My family and I live in the Market Neighborhood. I am deeply disappointed and concerned by the lack of awareness among most of the impacted residents. I am particularly alarmed that this proposal has seen minimal neighborhood engagement. Even more troubling is the fact that Kirkland is projected to meet all growth targets by 2044, with a surplus of 6,234 housing units and 858 jobs, without implementing these drastic changes. This makes the proposal seem irresponsible and unnecessary. I urge the Commission and Council to leave a different legacy. Rather than pushing density at all costs, let's have an open and respectful dialogue. Acknowledge that the required housing and job growth targets will be met with a significant surplus and stop using the Growth Management Act as a justification for this sweeping approach to density. I am asking you, to balance these efforts with infrastructure improvements, approved infrastructure budgets, and properly engaging in conversations about retaining Kirkland's unique charm and attractiveness through responsible growth. The proposed drastic height increases within residential neighborhoods will irreversibly change many of Kirkland's neighborhoods and disrupt the visual scale of the neighborhoods. The city's own capacity study proves that substantial growth can be achieved without these drastic height increases. As a resident deeply invested in the future and well-being of our community, I respectfully request the Planning Commission and City Council consider the attached document outlining changes to the Market Neighborhood Plan and the Market Street Corridor Plan. We can welcome future residents to a more beautiful, equitable, and safe space by taking the time to do this right. We can all do better than this.
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	West of Market resident opposed to high density land use changes along transit corridors
7/10/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	West of Market resident opposed to high density land use changes along transit corridors
7/8/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	Please insist on demanding studies of the ability of the existing infrastructure to absorb increased density. The Houghton plan change is a perfect example. The 68th and 108th intersection and the Central and Lake St. intersection are key intersections that must be addressed. Push the planners to justify going over capacity when density is increased. Leave the "density" to places like Totem Lake Village. Try to protect what continues to be referred to as "downtown." I've lived here since JCPenney's was "downtown." No way would that be appropriate now. Let's keep "Kirkland Old Town" the visitor draw that it is.
7/7/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	West of Market resident opposed to high density land use changes along transit corridors as too dense and not grounded on reality
7/7/2024	Land Use Changes transit corridors	<p>Opposed to the proposed 2044 Comprehension Plan, specifically concerning the implementation of high-density apartment and condo buildings in Kirkland. This plan, if enacted, will have detrimental effects on our neighborhood for a number crucial reasons, below to name a few:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Public Transit and Parking Issues: The plan assumes that the majority of new residents will utilize public transit, despite Kirkland's current public transit adoption rate of less than 5%. Consequently, developers will likely build limited parking spaces, leading to overflow parking on our streets. This will severely hinder access for emergency vehicles, delivery services, and visitors, potentially compromising safety to people esp to kids and pets due to limited visibility and congested road conditions.</li> <li>2.Unique Geographic Constraints: Kirkland's western boundary is entirely bordered by Lake Washington, unlike Downtown Redmond, which has multiple points of entry and exit. Increasing density without expanding infrastructure will significantly worsen traffic flow and could isolate parts of our community during peak times or emergencies.</li> <li>3.Infrastructure Capacity: I am concerned about the city's plan to scale essential infrastructure such as sewer pipes, utility lines, and water pipes to accommodate the projected growth. Without adequate upgrades, our existing infrastructure will struggle to support increased demands, potentially leading to service disruptions and environmental concerns. Has this been looked into?</li> <li>4.Preservation of Kirkland's Character: Kirkland prides itself on its unique character as a beachy, family-friendly town. Increasing density risks eroding this identity, making our community less appealing to families and altering the very fabric that defines Kirkland. Bellevue and Seattle already cater to younger, non-family demographics; Kirkland should preserve its distinct charm rather than sacrificing it to developers focused solely on profit.</li> </ol> <p>In conclusion, I urge the City Council to reconsider the implications of the 2044 Comprehension Plan on Kirkland's livability, safety, and community identity. I respectfully request transparency regarding the city's plans for infrastructure upgrades and a comprehensive assessment of how increased density will impact our neighborhood.</p>
6/13/2024	Land Use changes transit corridors	Support for dense development and increasing capacity along transit corridors

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
6/12/2024	Land Use changes transit corridors	Opposed to density along transit corridors; preference for urban villages with density focused around commercial
6/12/2024	Land Use changes transit corridors	Opposed to density along transit corridors in Market and Norkirk neighborhoods
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes- transit corridors	We are long time west of market residents and do feel that there needs to be some additional housing in Kirkland especially close to transit. I do not feel that there has been adequate thought put into the planned housing off of market street. Do not feel there is enough infrastructure in place. Does not seem like the housing would have designated parking either so would spill into streets. I would not support so much planned growth of this area of Kirkland off of market without more infrastructure in place.
7/9/2024	Land Use Changes- Infrastructure	Please consider the fact that changes in our Comprehensive Plans and other Planning Dept. concepts emphasize increased density without any reference to infrastructure, i.e., traffic. You all are dreaming if you expect people to stop driving cars. You haven't kept the roads we have in decent shape and increased traffic will only make them worse.
5/23/2024	Land Use Changes- Neighborhoods	Support: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•The frequent transit corridor overlay as shown in LU-4 in the Attachment 1A - Land Use Element</li> <li>•Eliminating Parking minimums city wide.</li> <li>•Getting the details right on missing middle housing so it actually gets built.</li> <li>•Allowing bigger apartment buildings in more areas within Kirkland</li> <li>•ACUs, Cornerstores, and Cafes in all residential zones.</li> </ul>
9/12/2024	Land Use Changes- Process	<p>According to the City of Kirkland's Rules of Procedure for the Planning Commission:</p> <p>"No member of the Planning Commission should participate in any Planning Commission discussion or vote on any matter in which the member has a personal or financial interest potentially sufficient to create a conflict between the interest in serving the public good and the other interest. The other interest may be private gain, financial or personal, and it may benefit the member, a relative, a friend, or an employer. Any disqualified member must leave the room when the matter is presented. The minutes shall show that the member left the room."</p> <p>Planning Commissioners Rodney Rutherford and Aaron Jacobson are two of twelve members of an advocacy group known as "Liveable Kirkland."</p> <p>Liveable Kirkland actively advocates for specific outcomes concerning the City of Kirkland's 2044 Comprehensive Plan. The group is vigorously promoting its interpretation of the proposed amendments to the 2044 Comprehensive Plan and Land Use Policy, while also providing contrary arguments to issues brought up by other Kirkland community members.</p> <p>Due to their active participation in the advocacy efforts of Liveable Kirkland, Commissioners Rutherford and Jacobson exhibit a conflict of interest that exceeds the threshold of "potentially sufficient," compromising their duties as Planning Commissioners. A clear example of this conflict is their proposed alternative drafts for Policy LU-2.4, which are scheduled for discussion in today's Planning Commission meeting.</p> <p>Commissioners Rutherford and Jacobson have each proposed alternative versions, labeled Alternatives B and C. These alternatives are more lenient than the Policy Draft reviewed at the Planning Commission public hearing on August 22, 2024. Alternatives B and C, presented by Commissioners Rutherford and Jacobson, respectively, would provide a significantly easier route for the 12 advocates of Liveable Kirkland, including the commissioners themselves, to realize their goals.</p> <p>The conflict of interest is evident. Commissioners Rutherford and Jacobson should recuse themselves from any Planning Commission discussions, deliberations, and decisions related to the 2044 Comprehensive Plan and Land Use policy.</p> <p>Should either Commissioner Rutherford or Jacobson fail to withdraw from these matters, I intend to request that the Kirkland City Council remove the conflicted Commissioner</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/21/2024	Land Use Element	<p>The board of directors of the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance (FHNA) would like to offer the Planning Commission several observations concerning the proposed Land Use Element of Kirkland's 2044 Comprehensive Plan Update. Transit Corridors. The FHNA board notes that City staff has made significant revisions to proposed LU-2.4 (concerning additional density along transit corridors). The changes outline a thoughtful approach to exploring density increases along transit corridors; in particular, the revised policy signifies that density increases would follow residential development in the NE 85th Station Area and would include robust community outreach and comment for each transit corridor zoning change. The FHNA board applauds these revisions. However, we encourage the City staff and the Planning Commission to revise the policy further to state that any transit corridor upzones should be considered in light of the residential and retail development potential of all urban villages or nodes in Kirkland and not just the NE 85th Station Area. Particularly important to the Finn Hill neighborhood is the redevelopment of the Inglewood Shopping Center on Juanita Drive near the northern boundary of Finn Hill. This strip mall was rezoned for residential and retail uses when the Finn Hill neighborhood plan was adopted in 2018. We urge the City to prioritize the redevelopment of this mall and similar neighborhood retail areas around Kirkland over efforts to upzone transit corridors in the immediate future. To that end, the FHNA board recommends that the Planning Commission adopt Plan B described in the staff memo. Even though the latest version of LU-2.4 is much improved, deferring adoption of the policy will maintain focus on promoting the development of housing in the areas best suited to provide the services that such housing requires. Deferring adoption of LU-2.4 also affords Kirkland citizens, who are now confused about the ramifications of the policy, more time to assess what the policy does (and does not) portend for their neighborhoods. The FHNA board does not express a preference for either Option B1 or B2; either appears to give the City the time needed to continue community outreach, to stimulate calm, thoughtful community dialog, and to monitor Kirkland's progress in meeting housing goals through the development of its urban centers and villages.</p> <p>Open Space. The open space section of the proposed Land Use Element includes policies that point to the "protection" and "distribution" of open space and parks near areas of increased development. These policies are laudable but the FHNA board advocates that they be stated more directly and forcefully. For example, the initial paragraph of the open space section of the Land Use Element currently says that open space "may" serve amenity, utilitarian and or recreational purposes. It should say that open space serves essential ecological, recreational and civic purposes. It should add that a liveable community requires access to ample green space and parks. And the specific policies in this section should promote not only the preservation and distribution of open spaces and parks but their expansion in order to meet community needs and environmental objectives as the population of Kirkland expands. We intend to submit separate comments on the proposed Open Space Element but we note here that we believe the Comprehensive Plan Update should incorporate measurable goals for open space, akin to the City's 10 minute neighborhood concept, and a commitment to achieving and maintaining a specific urban tree canopy percentage (at least 40%, although a higher percentage is not only better but realistic as well). The policies should also explicitly link open space and parkland acquisition to increased density, just as the proposed transit policies in the Land Use Element refer to additional development along transit corridors and in urban centers. We urge the Planning Commission to direct staff to upgrade the open space section of the Land Use Element accordingly.</p>
7/11/2024	Land Use Element	<p>1. Draft Proposed Kirkland 2044 Land Use Map</p> <p>a. Shouldn't the areas identified as Frequent Transit Corridors (shows as grey hatching on the Use Map) be re-zoned as Corridor Mixed Use?</p> <p>b. The Cross Kirkland Corridor, and a buffer of at least .25 miles either side of it, should be re-zoned as Corridor Mixed Use. It's basically a micro-mobility highway that runs from one end of the city to the other, passing through the two biggest areas slated for future development (Totem Lake and 85th St.) Let's empower it! People could live and work along it, and never need a car to meet all their needs.</p> <p>c. I think the areas immediately surrounding schools and parks should be re-zoned as Community Mixed Use (within a quarter- to half-mile radius, for example). This will lead to all-encompassing mixed-use neighborhoods, with housing, education, commerce, and entertainment/recreation all within the same areas, and the schools/parks acting as the anchors.</p> <p>2. Happy to see the 'default' become residential mixed use! Would this type of zoning include restaurants and cafes, too? Because it should.</p> <p>3. Great to see the push towards reducing or eliminating parking minimums!</p> <p>4. Great to see an effort to reduce minimum lot sizes! I'm assuming this would come with a revaluation of things like setbacks, floor-area ratios, etc? That might be too much detail for these policies.</p> <p>5. Policy LU-8.2</p> <p>a. Urge caution when it comes to 'protecting' neighborhoods; I think that's often a guise used by NIMBYs who don't want any kind of change.</p> <p>6. Maybe add some language about specifically preserving existing, mature trees? It's covered fairly well in the Sustainability, Climate, and Environment element, but I thought it might be worth including here, too.</p>
5/23/2024	Land Use Element	Getting the details right on missing middle housing so it actually gets built.
5/22/2024	Land Use Element	Allowing bigger apartment buildings in more areas within Kirkland
5/21/2024	Land Use Element	ACUs, Cornerstores, and Cafes in all residential zones.



## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/21/2024	Land Use Element	<p>Comments summarized by staff: We support the land use change requests for the Michaels site and Goodwill site in Juanita. These two sites would add hundreds of new homes that are desperately needed in the city; served by several bus routes and lie near a variety of amenities such as a grocery store, a post office, dentists, hair salons, restaurants Juanita Elementary School, Juanita High School, and the Juanita Aquatics Center, EvergreenHealth. We support the Frequent Transit Corridor Overlay (figure LU-4) and the “Corridor Mixed Use” land use definition. We believe that the 50 dwelling units per acre the City is currently studying for our transit corridors is too low. Liveable Kirkland will continue to advocate for a higher and more flexible figure during the SEIS’s public comment period. We support LU 1.3 &amp; 4.2 (zoning consolidation). We should strive to consolidate and simplify our zoning code. We should recognize the growing importance of mixed-use zoning. We oppose parts of LU 1.4 &amp; 5.1 (design review; transitions between intensities). Design review can impose onerous delays and expenses on multifamily residences; drive up costs while decreasing the usable space and energy efficiency for the building’s residents. We recommend striking these lines from LU 1.4: “transition strategies that bridge scales between areas with varying land use intensities” and “Effective land use transitions can also include building modulation, upper story stepbacks, and other building design elements.” We also recommend striking this line from LU 5.1: “Create effective transitions between areas of varying intensities.” We support LU 2.4, 3.1, 3.4, 3.6, 4.4, &amp; 7.2 (transit-oriented development; 10-minute neighborhoods; active transportation; reducing sprawl). The Land Use Element’s focus on these concepts is extremely encouraging. We believe these goals and policies will collectively be transformative. Together they will help build a city that is safe, healthy, convenient, communal, beautiful, and sustainable. We support LU 2.5 (equity; environmental justice). As we work to improve our city, we must prioritize the needs of our most underserved communities and provide them with safe, clean, and healthy spaces. We are proud to see that the Land Use Element acknowledges the importance of equity in urban design. We support LU 3.7 &amp; 5.8 (reducing and removing parking requirements). Parking is expensive to build, environmentally detrimental, and an inefficient use of space. Parking requirements force all residents and shoppers to subsidize drivers, and they lock us into a cycle of car dependency. We should eliminate parking mandates city-wide for all uses and allow residents and businesses to determine their own parking needs. We support LU 3.9 &amp; most of 5.1 (pedestrian accessibility; reducing car dependency). We should encourage pedestrian convenience and safety with new paths and fewer obstructions. Walkways should be safe, direct, and convenient, and destinations should be close together. We support LU 4.3 &amp; 5.8 (reduced minimum lot size; more fee-simple ownership). High minimum lot sizes effectively outlaw smaller homes. Reducing minimum lot size will give residents greater choice in housing, reduce the cost of housing, and provide more opportunities for home ownership. We support LU 4.6 (ACUs; corner stores). Small commercial uses within neighborhoods, such as corner stores and cafes, provide convenience and community while reducing car trips. We oppose LU 10.4 (construction near historic buildings). The language in this policy is vague. It is unclear what it means to “consider” or “respect” a historic building. Opponents of new homes may try to designate nearby buildings as historic to scuttle construction. We recommend striking LU 10.4 altogether, or at least explaining unambiguously what is expected of remodeling and construction adjacent to historic buildings.</p>
6/4/2024	Land use, transit corridors	Opposed to density along transit corridors; several underutilized commercial areas are best suited for focusing density
6/13/2024	Land use; growth; zero carbon	Support for action/ growth alternative; support for dense, active, zero carbon city.
6/13/2024	Land Use; housing supply; upzoning	Support for upzoning to increase housing supply; encouraging bold action in response to housing crisis
6/13/2024	Land use; housing, transit	Support for staff-proposed land use element, support for increased housing supply and reducing car dependency
6/13/2024	Land Use; transit corridors; middle housing; ACUs; parking	Support for additional capacity along transit corridors, eliminating parking requirements, boosting middle housing supply, allowing bigger apartment buildings in more areas, accessory commercial units/cornerstores/cafes in all residential zones
4/11/2023	Local hardware	Need a local hardware store around the Downtown area
9/30/2024	Kingsgate	There has been zero policies towards development in Kingsgate. The neighborhood public for Kingsgate were not even discussed, it is like a forgotten area in Kirkland.
4/11/2023	Medical uses	Around Evergreen Hospital, medical uses are being displaced with residential/commercial uses. City should provide incentives to retain medical services with new development
5/23/2024	Meeting Packet-Land Use	Eliminating Parking minimums city wide.
11/27/2023	Minimum Lot Sizes	Reduce minimum lot sizes, or subdivision/short plat lot size flexibility, to enable housing production
5/21/2024	Neighborhood Commercial	When you “explore” increasing allowances for small-scale neighborhood commercial uses and home-based businesses think expansively rather than restrictively. Being able to access day-to-day needs and other services within walking distance from home is important on so many levels, including community cohesion and sustainability.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/22/2024	Neighborhoods - Land Use Changes	<p>Our neighborhoods facilitate a sense of community. The City seems to think that having neighborhoods somehow prevents growth, additional density, 10-15 minute walk communities, and diversity and inclusion. This is not true at all. Instead of trying to eliminate/neutralize neighborhoods, the city should be working with neighborhoods to develop plans and policies that foster the goals and needs of the city and its residents while maintaining the vibrant and connected neighborhoods. Rather than pressing for land use changes to virtually every neighborhood that would drastically increase the allowed and target densities, the city should be more deliberate about evaluating how much additional density makes sense in each area based on what the existing infrastructure can support and whether there is the ability to increase the infrastructure, as well as the existing development and uses. For instance, Market St is already a major traffic arterial. During AM and PM rush hours, traffic is very bad. Increasing density along and within 1/4 miles of that corridor to 50 units/acre would completely change the nature of that corridor and would add substantially more people and traffic. Even if you assume - hope - that a majority of new residents would primarily walk, bike, take transit, that would require increased availability and frequency of public transit. Market St is not equipped to handle the traffic increase, nor is there ability to build additional infrastructure for that on Market St. Why not consider adopting policies that would allow for ~20/25 units/acre instead? Policies should allow for development of a mix of single family and various sized multi family. Kirkland's policies should support a mix of commercial businesses such as small groceries, drug stores, hardware stores, auto repair, and light industrial as well as shops and restaurants. Many of the existing and proposed policies favor high density residential and office development with very little for retail or other commercial and industrial uses.</p>
10/26/2023	Parking Standards	<p>Eliminate minimum parking requirements to reduce traffic and pollution, disincentivize walking. Parking is expensive to build; takes up land; reducing parking can make development less expensive to build so more affordable housing can be built; Removing parking allows for more walkable, livable spaces, and reduces environmental impacts of vehicles.</p>
5/24/2024	Parking Standards; neighborhood commercial; reduce design review requirements	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Strongly support reducing or removing parking minimums. Existing parking requirements lead to parking structures that are underutilized (oversized) and come at enormous expense. Construction costs of parking cause projects to be more expensive and provide less benefit (i.e. fewer units of housing, more expensive units, less retail square footage).</li> <li>•Strongly support language allowing small businesses in homes or separate structures on residential lots. Being able to fulfill daily needs with a quick walk or bike ride is liberating and often very pleasant! It also supports the city's sustainability goals, and can lower transportation costs for residents through putting fewer miles of wear and tear on their cars, reducing how many cars a household needs, or allowing households to live without needing to own a car.</li> <li>•Reduce the complexity of zoning and project reviews. Of course, developers can't just do whatever they please, but the system is needlessly complicated today. Having so many different categories and standards that vary from city to city makes each project different and hard to duplicate. The longer a design and permitting process lasts, the more likely that funding will become unavailable for a project and reset the whole process. We need to build more, with more variety, and faster.</li> </ul>
5/23/2024	School Design	<p>The Lake Washington School District (the "District") submits these comments regarding the proposed amendments to the Land Use Element of the City of Kirkland's Comprehensive Plan. The District's boundaries include nearly all of the City of Kirkland. While the District's student enrollment growth has slowed recently, we continue to plan for the school capacity needed to address recent growth and we anticipate that the City's projected growth will continue to require the delivery of additional school capacity. With this in mind, the District provides the following comments for consideration by the City as it reviews and updates the Land Use Element. The District appreciates that the City, to meet housing targets and recent legislation, is planning for increased density and a mix of diverse housing types. This planning, as it relates to schools, reinforces the District's need for the City's support related to the school impact fee program. Both the existence of the fee program and regular updates to ensure that fees adequately reflect current growth needs (which may change from time to time) are essential to mitigating the impacts of growth on schools. School impact fees, while providing only a small portion of the actual costs of capacity needed to serve growth, are critical to the District's overall capacity for funding schools and to ensure that existing taxpayers do not pay 100% of the costs related to new growth. While the continued collection of school impact fees and increased tax revenue help to address capacity impacts, these tools are neither comprehensive nor sufficient to address school siting needs. The District continues to need the City's assistance in finding developable land and space for new school capacity. We encourage the City to consider policies and development regulation amendments that facilitate school site development (height, setback, use, lot coverage, etc.). The City may need to consider code changes to allow school programming in retail or frontage spaces to enable further exploration and implementation of nontraditional school designs and programming. The District also encourages policies and regulations that encourage developers to integrate educational spaces into development planning. These changes would help address the City's desire for connectivity between housing and public services including schools. The District has a specific concern related to Policy LU-11.2, which encourages "quality designs" for public facilities, including schools. The language of the policy, in part, states that these facilities should: "...display exemplary design with attention to site planning, building scale, landscaping, pedestrian amenities, building details, and opportunities for integrating art into the project. They should be compatible with the neighborhood in which they are located, but can also provide a neighborhood landmark. Community structures such as City Hall, park and recreational facilities, libraries, and other civic buildings should be designed to be landmarks." Given the generality of this statement, we are unclear as to what exactly is intended, how implementing regulations may address this policy, and, most importantly for our taxpayers and our ability to deliver school facilities, how implementation would add to the cost of a new school or a school addition and affect our school programming. We request that more information is provided regarding the intent and anticipated implementation of this policy so that we can assess its impacts. The District reserves further comment on this policy in consideration of this request.</p>

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
4/11/2023	Senior businesses; services	Provide more places for seniors to socialize; to work; businesses that cater to seniors
4/11/2023	Senior housing	Need more senior housing that is one story; elevators; ADA accessible
9/24/2024	Single-Stair Construction	<p>I've noticed that an earlier draft policy relating to single-stair construction, H-1 #0, has since been replaced by H-1.10. Here is the text change:                      H-1 #0 "Increase housing diversity, including more family-sized 3+ bedroom multi-unit housing, and capacity near transit and employment by adjusting zoning to support additional residential intensity and local building code standards that support residential buildings up to six stories served by a single exit stairways."                      (emphasis mine)                      H-1.10 "Maximize the efficient use of residential land near transit with transit-supportive residential intensities, development standards and infrastructure improvements appropriate for more urbanized infill development patterns." (emphasis mine)</p> <p>I understand why this policy was rewritten considering how "six stories" was taken out of context by some people. In their defence, combining zoning changes and building code standard changes into the same policy was a confusing choice. That being said, considering the contributions single-stair construction makes to increasing housing affordability while allowing smaller buildings to pencil out, I think that its explicit removal here is a case of throwing the baby out with the bathwater.</p> <p>Here are some of pros of allowing single-stair buildings:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>* Single stair buildings allow for more windows, sunlight, and cross ventilation. If you require multiple stairs for a development then you'll need to connect them with a corridor. This results in units radiating out from this corridor. This is why condos and apartments in the US and Canada tend to resemble hotels. It means that unless you have a corner unit, it's unlikely you'll have windows facing anything but a single direction. Single stair construction eliminates the need for a corridor and essentially results in more units being corner units.</li> <li>* Single stair buildings use land more efficiently. You don't need to build as big a building if you can avoid an extra staircase and a hallway to connect it. This makes multi-unit construction more feasible on smaller lots and increases the amount of green space that can be left given the same number of units.</li> <li>* Single stair buildings are less expensive to build. Single stair construction allows for more of the building to actually be usable by those who buy/rent a unit. That means less overhead for the developer and a higher likelihood of individual projects penciling out.</li> <li>* Single stair encourages smaller developments. If you need to cover the overhead of an extra staircase and a corridor to connect it then you need to build a lot of units to make the investment pencil out. This isn't the case with single-stair. In fact, since every unit has to abut a central staircase there is a practical limit to how wide/deep a development can be. Rather than one block-sized building like you tend to see in the States, you get many narrower buildings as is common in Europe and Asia. Many people find the later to be more aesthetically pleasing.</li> </ul> <p>For the above reasons I urge you to re-add policy language specifically supporting building code standards for single-stair buildings.                      Thank you for your consideration and all the work you've been doing to update our Comp Plan for the next 20 years.</p>
11/17/2023	Street Lighting	Increase parking Downtown; improve street-sidewalk lighting
12/12/2023	Street Lighting - sustainability	Light pollution needs to be reduced. Reduce lumens in streetlights and if shields are used paint them flat black to reduce reflection. City needs to be more proactive in reducing light pollution. PSE will not change without city involvement.
4/30/2024	Traffic - development	The proposed development for 132nd st and 100th Ave does not consider the appropriate scale and impact on the neighborhoods. To add some six hundred units over retail is not think about what engages well with the neighborhood. The traffic during school pickup and dropoff times on 132nd is already quite backed up, compounded by southbound traffic on 100th during morning commute times and traffic to/from Juanita High School on 132nd
1/10/2024	Transit Oriented Development	Supports expanding housing options and increased density at a min. density of 6 unit buildings along frequent transit routes. Could expand from 1/4-1/2 walkshed.
3/10/2024	Transportation	Policy LU-3.3: Encourage housing, offices, shops, and services at or near the park and ride lots. As someone who consistently uses the South Kirkland Park and Ride, a location that demonstrates the ideal residential/transportation/commercial relationship, I agree that encouraging more of these types of developments is important. However, my question is how do we plan to do this? With Kirkland already being a widely developed city, is the plan to move outwards into totem lake, or rebuild old developments? As a Kirkland resident, I believe that a transit center next to Juanita Village could align very well with this plan.
5/28/2024	Tribe comments - various	Snoqualmie Tribe Land Use comments: The City is encouraged to expand its cultural context throughout the comprehensive plan to include significant indigenous resources. For tree canopy, it is to recognize that mature native conifers provide the highest ecosystem benefits, wildlife habitat, and cultural significance in representing the ancestral forest landscape. Land Use Goal LU-1 must go beyond protection of environmentally sensitive areas to include retention of mature trees and groves, as directed in Chapter 95 of the zoning code. While community "character" has been removed from Goal LU-4 (and subsequent policies), the city's vision for livability and resilience in its residential neighborhoods must include tree canopy. In policy LU-4.5, the city's objective of "environmental sustainability" may imply this, but it would be helpful to make the inclusion explicit.

## Land Use Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Vacancy Rate	I am concerned about the high vacancy rate of mixed use buildings in Kirkland. For-profit developers are being enabled to build high ROI mix-use buildings in Kirkland and keep rents very high which encourage vacancy. We have empty apartments in Vela, which charge up to \$9k/mo in rent. Urban 1 is empty on the upper floors for retail. Urban 2 is empty. The mixed-use buildings below Vela (old Hector's) are empty. The new Bartell's on Central way is now vacant. The old PCC building is losing money each month. Why can't the city enforce developers to lower vacancies and fine the owners until retail is filled up? Please let me know your thoughts...
5/22/2024	Variances	I agree with adopting a policy of developing and maintaining clear, predictable, and objective development regulations that are easy to understand and consistent. That should include not routinely granting variance requests. Currently, variances are granted routinely even when the criteria for variances are not truly met. This has allowed for ever larger single-family homes that have contributed to the increased price of buying and owning a home in Kirkland.

## Transportation Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/1/2023	Accessibility	Ensure the transportation is inclusive for people of all ages/abilities
5/1/2023	Accessibility	Additionally, consider that people with lower incomes may be forced to drive because they live farther away from amenities due to underinvestment in transit.
5/1/2023	Accessibility	keep options for seniors in mind - eventually people will be older and not able to use bicycles
5/1/2023	Accessibility - e-bikes	options as a senior - ebikes not a great longterm option
5/1/2023	Accessibility - multimodal options	ensure that disabled and aging community members are able to safely move without driving.
5/1/2023	Accessibility - multimodal options	prioritize all ages and abilities bike and ped infrastructure
5/1/2023	Active transportation network	East-west connections for multimodal networks
5/1/2023	Active transportation network	Ensure the safety of pedestrians and cyclists through sidewalk connections, maintenance, connected and protected bike lanes, and
5/1/2023	Active transportation network	High Quality Active Transportation Infrastructure
5/1/2023	Active transportation network	High Quality Active Transportation Infrastructure
5/1/2023	Bicycling	bikes, e-bikes, cargo bikes
5/1/2023	Bicycling construction detours	construction site safety for biking
5/1/2023	Bike infrastructure	better bike parking
5/1/2023	Bike infrastructure	Safe bike infrastructure
5/1/2023	Bus service	less investment in public transit, in outlying neighborhoods. Kingsgate used to be better. More frequent buses
5/1/2023	Bus service	more bus routes
5/1/2023	Bus service	need to make it easier. finn hill has only one bus
5/1/2023	CKC	How about 'a' paved path on CKC but not 'only' a paved path on the CKC. There is room for both.
5/1/2023	CKC	Would like to see part of the CKC paved to avoid dirt, etc.
5/1/2023	CKC	CKC is a park space
5/1/2023	CKC	The current gravel surface also is part of the charm, as are the split rail fences. It needs to be thought of as a park as well as a tra
5/1/2023	CKC - accessibility	south 1/3 of CKC does not have ADA entrances. Steep hills & stairs
5/1/2023	CKC - accessibility	wheelchair access to the CKC
5/1/2023	CKC - e-bikes	Any paving on CKC needs to be done in tandem with separating bikes and peds. If we pave with the idea of separating later, we'll
5/1/2023	CKC - e-bikes	electric bikes are faster and heavier than non- electric bikes - I am worried about accidents on the CKC trail and even more so if it
5/1/2023	CKC - e-bikes	separation of walkers and bikers
5/1/2023	CKC - e-bikes	separation of people walking and ebikes on the CKC
5/1/2023	CKC - maintenance	Ensure proper transportation system maintenance through proper budget and staffing to repair and sweep sidewalks/bike lanes and
5/1/2023	CKC - multimodal options	Finish the CKC properly and solve this--make a split trail with a paved section for wheels for those of us who want to get around qu
5/1/2023	CKC - multimodal options	cleanly!) and a slower gravel lane adjacent.
5/1/2023	Communication	email communications instead of postcards
5/1/2023	Communication - outreach	social media for messaging
5/1/2023	Definitions	"Accessible Communities" rather than walkable.
5/1/2023	E-bikes	E-Bikes! Make it more accessible to ride uphill. Provide option for families to drop from 2 to 1 car family. Roads need to be and fee
5/1/2023	E-bikes	e-bikes. need infrastructure to park them to make them more practical
5/1/2023	E-bikes	Innovation and Electrification - policy and regulations that regulate shared use environments between e-bikes and pedestrians, infr
5/1/2023	E-bikes	locking/storage, etc. Infrastructure should support the increased use of electric bikes and vehicles by prioritizing e-bikes and e-s-
5/1/2023	E-bikes - policy	charging stations in more places.
5/1/2023	E-bikes - policy	Pedestrian - bike/e-mobility conflicts design and policy solutions

## Transportation Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/1/2023	E-bikes - policy	Policy around how e-bikes are utilized. Not one size fits all. Can be fast like mini motorcycles in bike lanes. How can we mix safe us
5/1/2023	Education	community education is needed
5/1/2023	Education	people need to realize they are responsible for maintaining sidewalk clearance from vegetation - more education
5/1/2023	E-Vehicles	electric vehicles, charging stations
5/1/2023	E-Vehicles	Electrification of vehicles
5/1/2023	E-Vehicles	Electric vehicle charging and parking
5/1/2023	E-Vehicles	Yes, EVs are great for reducing local emissions, but they're still the same size and we have fixed road space with exponential population problem. (EVs also shed more tire and brake particulates given their weight which are bad for air and water quality)
5/1/2023	Flexible Transit	Flexible Transit
5/1/2023	Green Stormwater Infrastructure	bioswales - green protection for bike lanes
5/1/2023	Green Stormwater Infrastructure	More re-greening of greenways. Bioswales and bike lanes
5/1/2023	Green Stormwater Infrastructure	system sustainability - multipurpose bioswales as greenways for protected infrastructure. Combine stormwater runoff with checking
5/1/2023	Greenways	more greenways, easier access
5/1/2023	Land use policy	Link to Land Use - Ensure consistency between land use, transportation planning and implementation.
5/1/2023	Livable Communities	longer commutes for service workers and teachers
5/1/2023	Maintenance	Maintain what we have. CKC is a good example. Without paving
5/1/2023	Maintenance	maintained roads
5/1/2023	Maintenance	Walk/Bike Facility Maintenance
5/1/2023	Maintenance - bike lanes	sweep bike lanes
5/1/2023	Maintenance - sidewalks	responsiveness to citizen requests for maintenance. sidewalks!
5/1/2023	Metro Flex	I love the new Metro Flex offered to Juanita/Totem Lake/Finn Hill!
5/1/2023	Microtransit	Eastgate - shuttle system for REI and other companies
5/1/2023	Microtransit	Feeder routes shuttles ( Cold be like a minivan) to connect to TC
5/1/2023	Microtransit	Micro transit for low density areas
5/1/2023	Microtransit	on-demand shuttle service with large use zone
5/1/2023	Microtransit	promote services like on-demand shuttles
5/1/2023	Microtransit	safe/on demand shuttles
5/1/2023	Microtransit	short distant shuttles. use vacant or lightly used parking lots as parking to take a shuttle. mainly for quick short shuttle rides around
5/1/2023	Microtransit - accessibility	Increase in community vans for those that can't drive. stations where senior can walk to van and go to various places in our area.
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	# 1 - Create a more equitable and Multimodal mobility system
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Biking is getting more popular, especially e-bikes and electric scooters and one wheelers. Pair with better transit options, compact,
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	cyclists and pedestrians have been short changed - were not considered in original infrastructure
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Discourage car ownership. Transit-oriented development
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	e-scooters, foldable and locking tech
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Kirkland was laid out for cars, people are accustomed to this . Adding a bike lane can seem impossible "to the privileged, equality
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	More opportunities for safe Multimodal mobility options - addresses stress on traffic and parking demand
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	multimodal lanes, flex lanes at times of day
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Multimodal transit connections
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	need to motivate those driving to utilize other methods
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	personal electric transport - monowheels, scooters
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	PRT - Personalized Rapid Transit

## Transportation Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	safely mix walk, bike, ebike users
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Safely Move People - Support a transportation system and related government and private actions that promote all viable forms of build and maintain partnerships locally, regionally and nationally, to further our transportation goals.
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Tech is changing, people are WFH. From 3-5pm traffic is clogged. Alt methods of transportation. Innovations already by E-Bikes a user friendly roads for alt transport (bikes, scooters). Make sure no holes in road for safety. Will be all electric cars. Need more cha use of electric cars.
5/1/2023	Multimodal options	Vision of active transportation world. Adopt best practices in locations in US that rely on cars.
5/1/2023	Multimodal options - accessibility	e-bikes for seniors. or tricycles!
5/1/2023	Multimodal options - accessibility	transit options for aging comfortably
5/1/2023	Multimodal options - communication	promote multimodal services - messaging
5/1/2023	Multimodal options - maintenance	maintenance for all modes infrastructure is safety
5/1/2023	Multimodal options - sustainability	Electric cars are good, but they only are a small improvement on internal combustion cars. In contrast, e-bikes and e-scooters mak climate, for needing less parking spaces, etc.
5/1/2023	N/A	Sticky Bank
5/1/2023	Outreach	demonstration of new transit services at events
5/1/2023	Outreach	hiring people that aren't working for the city to advocate for programs
5/1/2023	Outreach/Education	education at farmers markets
5/1/2023	Parks and green spaces	Green communities - Policies should improve access to parks and green corridors in all neighborhoods, focusing on those that hav new parks or connecting existing parks to neighborhoods by trail network.
5/1/2023	Policy	Policy LU-4.1: Maintain and enhance the character of Kirkland's residential areas.
5/1/2023	Policy	Wording of policy conflicts with itself - Located near public transit while also increasing density all over the city. Re-word to emphas the city.
5/1/2023	Policy verbiage	self driving cars seems too specific
5/1/2023	Project implementation	not enough staff to design all the infrastructure that is needed. money is a challenge - not enough. Taken 10 yrs to build 1 greenwa
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes	bike lanes sandwiched between parked cars & road. consider repainting bike lanes (near curb). Use parked cars to protect cyclists
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes	flex lanes means no cyclists can safely use lanes. also, infrastructure needed for bike lanes would not support cars (planters/bollar
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes	parking protected bike lanes
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes	prefer dedicated & protected bike lanes
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes	protected bike lanes
5/1/2023	Protected bike lanes - sidewalks	protected bike lanes and ped lanes
5/1/2023	Safety - pedestrian	Pedestrian safety in terms of protection from vehicular traffic.
5/1/2023	Safety - pedestrian	people walking are vulnerable
5/1/2023	Safety - pedestrian	protected crosswalks
5/1/2023	Self-driving vehicles	Need to think about self driving cars that park themselves
5/1/2023	Self-driving vehicles	Self-driving pod situation in 20 years
5/1/2023	Sidewalk maintenance	resident vegetation trimming - sidewalk access
5/1/2023	Sidewalks	protected sidewalks
5/1/2023	Speed control	change geometry of roadways to encourage slower speeds
5/1/2023	Speed control	not just more cars - control speeds
5/1/2023	Speed control	slow down cars
5/1/2023	Speed control	slower speeds
5/1/2023	Sustainability	Be Sustainable - Support a transportation system that can be sustained over the next 50 years.
5/1/2023	Sustainability	encourage tree planting along the roads. appropriate trees. reduce heat rising from the streets.
5/1/2023	Sustainability	environmental- reduce idling, non-vehicle travel, sustainable building, culverts

## Transportation Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/1/2023	Sustainability	planted traffic circles - reduce asphalt
5/1/2023	Sustainability	Q2: Make environmental sustainability more explicit, i.e., Support a transportation system that can be sustained ecologically and financially for 100 years and contribute to reductions in greenhouse gas emissions
5/1/2023	Sustainability	reduce environmental problems through increasing use of community vans/shuttles .
5/1/2023	Sustainability/multimodal mobility/ckc/paving	Holistic sustainability-- environmental sustainability of walk/bike infrastructure to improve air quality, reduce congestion and greenhouse gas emissions. proper transportation system maintenance through proper budget and staffing to repair and sweep sidewalks/bike lanes and pave
5/1/2023	Traffic	If things stay the same, assuming more density. More people needing cars and driving. More traffic & congestion.
5/1/2023	Traffic	traffic calming - circles
5/1/2023	Traffic	And the science from other cities doing some implementation actually shows that inserting bike lanes and remove parking, actually reduces traffic stress AT ALL!
5/1/2023	Traffic	level of traffic stress
5/1/2023	Traffic - data	count people, not cars
5/1/2023	Traffic - data	measure success of roadways using LTS. transition away from LOS
5/1/2023	Traffic - equity	Congestion Relief, Transportation Equity
5/1/2023	Transit access	free orca cards for students
5/1/2023	Transit Infrastructure	more frequent transit service
5/1/2023	Transit Infrastructure	Transit infrastructure is way behind over countries.
5/1/2023	Transit network	hyperlocal transit. circular bus around the city
5/1/2023	Transit network	Increased transit service - frequency, fewer transfers, more geography
5/1/2023	Transit network	Innovative transit services like local shuttles, increased frequency and transit coverage will ensure all of Kirkland's neighborhoods are accessible. they want to get to without having to drive to them.
5/1/2023	Transit network	major changes in transit because of the way people work. need diverse transit movement throughout cities, not just a main bus to downtown
5/1/2023	Transit network	shuttle service is too restricted for my family to utilize. places they need to go, mainly teens, are outside the service zone
5/1/2023	Transit network - routes	longer transit routes-fewer xfers
5/1/2023	Transit-Oriented Development	dedicated bus lanes, transit priority
5/1/2023	Transit-Oriented Development	if encouraging more people to use transit, need to make them go faster and less crowded. remove car lanes
5/1/2023	Transit-Oriented Development	shuttles and transit lanes
5/1/2023	Transportation Equity	Transportation Equity
5/1/2023	Transportation infrastructure	aesthetics of bike/ped infrastructure - totem lake connector
5/1/2023	Transportation infrastructure	skinny streets
5/1/2023	Transportation Infrastructure (ITS)	automation, smart systems/signals for detection and cycles
5/1/2023	Transportation Infrastructure (ITS)	intelligent transportation systems. city has invested in this to improve LOS & car traffic flow. can create more demand when you free up space
5/1/2023	Transportation Infrastructure (ITS)	ITS
5/1/2023	Transportation Infrastructure (ITS)	using automation & tech. If there is no vehicle in a lane, have lights auto turn green.
5/1/2023	Transportation network	transportation is more than just moving people. other considerations such as how smoothly & accessible. 124th bridge is great example
5/1/2023	Transportation; Policy	Transportation Guiding Principles
5/1/2023	Vision zero	vision zero
5/1/2023	Walkability	Investments in pedestrian infrastructure to support walkability.



## Transportation Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/1/2023	Walkability	more pedestrian bridges. connect neighborhoods that are split by 405. take design into consideration to motivate people to use it
5/1/2023	Walkability	ped bridges across 405
5/1/2023	Walkability - mixed use	Bridle Trails, Kirkland urban. Walkable areas. Mix of uses
5/1/2023	Walkability - multimodal options	invest in safe, connected walking and bicycling infrastructure as well as increased transit service so people can get around without
5/1/2023	Walkability/ outreach & communication	Street closures for pedestrian activity
5/1/2023	Walkability/transit network	Walkable communities, transit access
5/1/2023	Walkable neighborhoods	Walkable communities - Policies should enhance and improve connectivity by locating housing, parks, entertainment, and commo access to public transportation, walking, and biking trails to reduce the reliance on cars and parking.

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
6/27/2023	ADA codes	Require road widths, turn around, parking stalls for ADA accessibility
9/22/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I am writing to seek your thoughts on Dr. Emily King's recent letter highlighting concerns about the tax burden that new developments may impose on our working-class residents, who are already facing high property taxes.</p> <p>I share her concern that the Multifamily Tax Exemption (MFTE), a crucial aspect of our urbanization proposals, seems to provide tax benefits to wealthy developers and new residents of upscale constructions, while existing residents in older homes bear the costs of city services and infrastructure upgrades. Therefore, I urge the city to consider shifting the focus from MFTE-driven large developments to smaller subdivisions and projects.</p> <p>Furthermore, after listening to Dr. Paule Dure's address to the City Council, it is clear that our city currently lacks the staffing and resources needed to effectively manage such large-scale urbanization efforts. I am concerned about how we can undertake these ambitious initiatives without the guidance of a staff economist or a dedicated firm to conduct a thorough economic study.</p> <p>Thank you for your attention to these important matters. I look forward to hearing your insights.</p>
9/11/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>Housing is a very important topic to me. My mother lives here in Kirkland on a small fixed income. My wife and I want her to live here since she has roots in this community and so that we can assist her as she ages in place. To make that possible we've been needing to supplement her income more and more as rent continues to rise each year. My wife and I would love to start a family of our own soon too but worry that we'll have to move somewhere more affordable ourselves once it's time for a bigger house. As you are acutely aware, our city and our region are undergoing an extreme affordability crisis. In Kirkland it's impossible for the vast majority of people who work here to afford to live here as well. Far too many families who try to call Kirkland home must spend well in excess of 1/3 of their income just to put a roof over their heads. Living in Kirkland has become less and less obtainable for decades and it's no surprise that today's elected officials and staff are working to correct the shortsightedness that brought us to today. The irony is probably not lost on you. The irony that in trying to address Kirkland's housing woes you've pushed up against the very force that put us on our current trajectory. It's reasonable for Neighborhood Defenders to object to unstudied, drastic change. But it's unreasonable to object to studying the potential for moderate change. It's been very discouraging to see a group of people so dedicated to obstructing even planning for more housing that they're willing to lie and fearmonger to get their way.</p> <p>Transit Oriented Development is not a new concept, nor an unproven one. TOD isn't skyscrapers by definition, it's just higher density than the surrounding area. In our case the vast majority of Kirkland is zoned for low density (over 80% of our residential zones mandate low density usage). Medium density (staff have suggested 2-4 stories could work well) would both allow our city to grow and diversify our housing stock while fitting in well with the majority of our city being single family housing. Addressing Kirkland's housing shortage is just one piece of the puzzle when it comes to making our community affordable for all. But it's an indispensable piece nonetheless. The goal of housing abundance isn't to meet some arbitrary county-set number. It's to ensure that the cost of rent/mortgage is based on building age and construction costs, not scarcity.</p> <p>Thank you for your hard work in making our community stronger, more resilient, and more welcoming. I know it's a thankless job, especially on emotional topics like this. Remember, the Kirkland of 2045 will be a much better city thanks to your boldness and passion</p>
9/3/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I am a Kirkland resident and wanted to reach out regarding the Kirkland 2044 Comprehensive Plan. As I'm sure you are aware, there are a lot of signs posted in yards of those who are against the new zoning proposed in the plan. I actually live in an apartment along Market Street, which is designated for increased density. Many of my neighbors are very upset by the new plan, but they have the fortune of living in a house. My family does not. I am an employee at Lake Washington School District, yet am unable to afford any house or condo in Kirkland or nearby that I think is suitable for my family. I work in a Kirkland school, yet can't afford to buy a home in Kirkland. This fact is hard to comprehend. And I certainly am not unique. I love my job, but the pay is inadequate. So much so, I work an additional 30 hours a week in a different field. And was still offered a mortgage at \$300,000 by my bank. Yikes.</p> <p>The ARCH program is great, but is insanely competitive. My wife and I dream, but we are not delusional. I hope the new zoning that has been proposed saturates Kirkland with enough new housing to allow families like mine the opportunity to purchase a home in the community we love. We've lived here for eight years, and there has yet to be such an opportunity for us</p>
8/30/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>We now live in the much more affordable Juanita neighborhood, but my family used to rent a small older home in the Norkirk neighborhood. My kids went to Peter Kirk Elementary with kids living West of Market, many of whom lived in enormous mansions.</p> <p>During the years that we lived in that area, we witnessed small older home after small older home be replaced by McMansion after McMansion. Redevelopment is inevitable as long as our economy remains vibrant. But what kind of redevelopment happens is up to us to determine. I do not want to see Kirkland redevelop into exclusively more and more expensive single-family mansions that are unobtainable except for the very rich. Let's legalize housing of all types and sizes so that everyone who wants to live in Kirkland, especially in central neighborhoods close to frequent transit, can call Kirkland home. For the sake of my kids being able to stay in Kirkland, for the sake of teachers and healthcare and grocery workers, for the sake of everyone who depends on workers being able to live here -- please allow the kind of redevelopment that preserves -- and increases! -- diversity of income in Kirkland. Exclusive communities are not robust communities.</p>
8/29/2024	Affordable Housing	Kirkland must embrace and promote affordable housing to keep our city rich in talent, diversity, and business.

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/28/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I was unable to attend the meeting on August 22nd to discuss providing more affordable housing options plans for Kirkland, but I understand that comments are being received until September 11th. Please forward on to others as necessary.</p> <p>On the Kirkland 2044 Comprehensive Plan Update some of the first words you see are "YOU BELONG HERE – Sustainable – Connected- Welcoming". I'm lucky enough to be a part of a community in the Kingsgate Neighborhood that, if I was just starting out as we were when we purchased 20 years ago, we couldn't afford today.</p> <p>Our neighborhood used to be full of nurses and teachers who are being currently priced out. Affordable housing is in everyone's best interest. I suspect that the voices that are for affordable housing drastically outweigh those against but the voices against have to time and, frankly, resources to oppose. We need to be the voices of those who aren't getting the opportunity to be a part of this community. Diversity enriches communities. You don't have to dig deep into the research from all manner of studies to show that when our kids grow up in schools with diversity, they have more empathy and a more rounded world view. When we can support teachers that can live in the communities they teach in, we have better communities. When we have neighbors that come from multiple backgrounds, we have the same results of empathy and connectedness.</p> <p>Please continue to plan for affordable housing in Kirkland so we can keep the richness in our neighborhoods, schools and greater city. Let us truly be sustainable, connected, and welcoming.</p>
8/28/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I've been a resident of Kirkland for almost 30 years now and I'm passionate about our city. One of the things I have loved is watching our great community grow in diversity over the years. The demographics have shifted in some beautiful ways. I would love to see that continue, but in order for that to be so, there needs to be affordable housing options for Kirkland in the future. .... I can assure you that we would not be able to afford a home in Kingsgate today...I hope you'll consider the next generation as you make plans for future housing</p>
8/23/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I am a long time resident of Kirkland, I have lived here for over 20 years, and sadly I couldn't afford to buy the home I live in today at today's prices. I am writing to encourage planning for more affordable housing along the transit corridor and in the city generally, and more mixed use neighborhoods to ensure equitable housing opportunities for all income levels. We can't be a city of millionaires. We need to provide affordable housing for those who work here. The workers at Metropolitan Market, PCC, QFC, the many restaurants we love to eat at, and the many small businesses that make our community thrive; they all need affordable places to live. We don't need more mc-mansions replacing modest homes. We do need more apartments and small condos/starter homes so young families can get started in our community. I hope the planning commission makes the right decisions to support these goals.</p>
8/23/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I have been studying your concern about generating more human density in our community. It seems that public/private cooperation would go a long way in developing new, more affordable housing. But rather than adding 4 to 6 stories to single family neighbourhoods and buying land with our tax dollars, why don't you streamline the permitting process to make it easier and more affordable to develop and fill in the space that we have with current zoning. I have waited almost a year for a permit to install a gate in my driveway. I now need an architect's rendering to proceed. And it took almost 4 months to get approval for a simple remodel of my kitchen and bath. The current zoning is fine. YOU can help the affordability issue by reducing regulation and red tape. Thanks for your consideration.</p>
8/23/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>We attended the meeting last night on the transit corridor, and found it difficult to stand for hours. We ended up leaving after hearing person after person say almost the same words in favor of increasing development along the "transit corridor." I have already spoken on traffic and environmental concerns. It sounds like you are listening. Thank you! 1. Unless something horrendous happens, Kirkland houses will always be expensive and out of reach. This is mostly due to the interest rate rise and the fact that everyone wants a house in this lakeside and forested area. Apartments will not increase the amount of houses available. ....2. Our neighborhood (on Finn Hill) is very diverse, representing people from China, Japan, Africa, Latin America, Mexico, Russia, Turkey, India, Sri Lanka, Bangladesh, and likely more countries I'm unaware of, as well as several gay couples and elderly folks. We have low income people sharing a house two doors down from us. We are diverse and getting more wonderfully diverse daily. 3. Our schools are good because people like me and those people from China, Africa and Bangladesh volunteer in classrooms and vote for all the school bonds. Schools like Juanita, which are partly fed by the apartments don't have quite the volunteers or support that other schools in the area do. ....4. It isn't just the housing that is expensive. Many people in our neighborhood have relied on the Totem Lake and Redmond Value Villages that closed and now rely on the Goodwill at the bottom of the hill for necessities like plates and clothing. Cutting corners at Goodwill is what has made housing in Kirkland possible to afford for many of us. ....</p> <p>5. The apartments in question-- even huge blocky, Berlin-like ones such as the multi-stories surrounding Totem Lake on all sides are not low income. They begin at \$2,000 for a one bedroom, 3,000 for a two bedroom and rising. In fact, their rent is more than the houses in our area. Somebody is raking in the money and may have more than one committee member and "Concerned citizen speaking out" in their pocket. 6. Those speaking out acted as though those raising concern are being emotional "fear-mongering." Then they filled the room with emotions about daycare, wanting their hairstylists to live in Kirkland, and how they wanted their children to afford living in Kirkland. As people moving out and commuting want a house. This is emotional rather than logical appeal. Knowing the traffic, loving the environment and depending on the schools all give residents valid cause for concern. The speakers felt stacked and the call for an immediate vote felt money-motivated. Likely it was. I'm hoping you will all do some big thinking about what you want this amazing city to be in the future. Seattle paved paradise. Do we want to? I do not. What then?</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/20/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I'd like to share my story and a couple of constructive suggestions for the Comp Plan 2044.</p> <p>About me and my perspective: I'm an immigrant and for the first 5+ years of my life in the US, I slept on the floor next to my parents' bed. We shared a 3-bedroom house with 2 other immigrant families. I was a latchkey kid as both my parents frequently worked double overtime at their blue-collar jobs. I lived the life of needing affordable housing. Then I joined the Army and saw many young Soldiers and their families struggle financially - the leadership would step in and help as much as they could. I'm aligned with and applaud the city, county, and state for creating the goals of increased affordable housing, sustainability, and DEI. Where we disagree is how to achieve those goals.</p> <p>Now, I'm an analyst and I know the limitations of my expertise. In 2020, my wife was pregnant during the pandemic and it was frightening to see tons of vaccine claims/misinformation online. Fortunately, Kirkland has great doctors and we were advised to get vaccines - and we were able to ask questions about risk trade-offs, the data, and the science. Today online, I see microeconomics claims such as "we need to change regulations to enable and encourage the market to provide of a broader diversity of affordable and workforce housing." There's no citation of research or economist cited on this website to prove that this is feasible or if it's been done successfully with reasonable benchmarks. This is simply an opinion that can be misleading, if not substantiated.</p> <p>In fact, in a recent PBS article, "Michele Thomas, director of policy and advocacy at the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance, said the state needs to put more emphasis on affordable-housing construction, not necessarily all types of new housing construction," and "We don't need more luxury apartments built," she said. "What we need is affordable housing."</p> <p>Unfortunately, neither Michelle or I are economists and I've limited knowledge on supply, demand, and price (in)elasticity - so my first ask is to bring in an expert economist to forecast the pricing impacts of both the 85th Street plan (standalone) and the Comp Plan (85th + Transit Corridors). There was a recent article in Komo news about how the Redfin chief economist stated that rents were cheaper this year than last in Seattle - fantastic! The price drop was a meager \$50 down to ~\$2100, but that \$50 means a lot to needy families and likely compensates for some inflation. It would be great to get someone of her profile to get their team to forecast how much rent and housing prices would decrease/increase vs. if we didn't build housing, as we should set price impact expectations with our fellow Kirkland residents. This economist can also evaluate the risk of only conducting the 85th Street plan (standalone) vs. the Comp Plan (85th Street plan + Transit Corridors). There are unproven claims online that the 85th street plan is "putting all our eggs in one basket" - it would be prudent to get an expert to quantify the actual risk difference between the two plans rather than have the public be misinformed.</p> <p>I'm also not an expert in parenting, but I try my best to learn and frequently chat with child experts: pediatricians, child psychologists and daycare teachers. I see many of the teachers take the bus from far away so I empathize deeply. With that, the Comp Plan has no mention of any benefits for the 20,000+ children in Kirkland! The Comp plan should be a grand vision to make this an even better place for all our kids (that's why many of us moved here). My second ask is for the Lake Washington School District and Allegro Pediatrics to write a section on what they think the ideal state of the city should be for the children...</p>
8/20/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>I'm a Kirkland resident (unrelated, I'm on the Salary Commission). I'd like to share my story and a couple of constructive suggestions for the Comp Plan 2044.</p> <p>About me and my perspective: I'm an immigrant and for the first 5+ years of my life in the US, I slept on the floor next to my parents' bed. We shared a 3-bedroom house with 2 other immigrant families. I was a latchkey kid as both my parents frequently worked double overtime at their blue-collar jobs. I lived the life of needing affordable housing. Then I joined the Army and saw many young Soldiers and their families struggle financially - the leadership would step in and help as much as they could. I'm aligned with and applaud the city, county, and state for creating the goals of increased affordable housing, sustainability, and DEI. Where we disagree is how to achieve those goals.</p> <p>Now, I'm an analyst - and I know the limitations of my expertise. In 2020, my wife was pregnant during the pandemic and it was frightening to see tons of vaccine claims/misinformation online. Fortunately, Kirkland has great doctors and we were advised to get vaccines - and we were able to ask questions about risk trade-offs, the data, and the science. Today online, I see microeconomics claims such as "we need to change regulations to enable and encourage the market to provide of a broader diversity of affordable and workforce housing." There's no citation of research or economist cited on this website to prove that this is feasible or if it's been done successfully with reasonable benchmarks. This is simply an opinion that can be misleading, if not substantiated.</p> <p>In fact, in a recent PBS article, "Michele Thomas, director of policy and advocacy at the Washington Low Income Housing Alliance, said the state needs to put more emphasis on affordable-housing construction, not necessarily all types of new housing construction," and "We don't need more luxury apartments built," she said. "What we need is affordable housing."</p> <p>Unfortunately, neither Michelle or I are economists and I've limited knowledge on supply, demand, and price (in)elasticity - so my first ask is to bring in an expert economist to forecast the pricing impacts of both the 85th Street plan (standalone) and the Comp Plan (85th + Transit Corridors). There was a recent article in Komo news about how the Redfin chief economist stated that rents were cheaper this year than last in Seattle - fantastic! The price drop was a meager \$50 down to ~\$2100, but that \$50 means a lot to needy families and likely compensates for some inflation. It would be great to get someone of her profile to get their team to forecast how much rent and housing prices would decrease/increase vs. if we didn't build housing, as we should set price impact expectations with our fellow Kirkland residents. This economist can also evaluate the risk of only conducting the 85th Street plan (standalone) vs. the Comp Plan (85th Street plan + Transit Corridors). There are unproven claims online that the 85th street plan is "putting all our eggs in one basket" - it would be prudent to get an expert to quantify the actual risk difference between the two plans rather than have the public be misinformed.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
3/19/2024	Affordable Housing	Housing options for all income levels is critical and that includes those considered homeless or in transition.
10/31/2023	Affordable Housing	The Eastside desperately needs more affordable housing, as our shelters are currently full and without anywhere for people to go, existing camping bans cannot even be legally enforced, leading to difficult community relations
9/6/2023	Affordable Housing	Should have places available and at low cost for those who cannot afford "\$1500" a month to rent. There are those who get social security and low-income who cannot afford the rent prices. Why not take an old hotel/motel and turn that into housing the homeless.
8/3/2023	Affordable Housing	There is a high need for affordable housing in Kirkland. Please include affordable housing in your 2044 Comprehensive Plan, Parcel 3885808616 is ready and waiting. Before the city parking project that parcel had a duplex and a single home/ Let's put in homes for city employees and downtown workers.
7/31/2023	Affordable Housing	How can we keep the cost of market rate housing down? Affordable housing is great but it can take years to get placed in housing.
7/31/2023	Affordable Housing	Require and greatly increase the construction of starter homes that lower income folks can purchase.
7/12/2023	Affordable Housing	With such high prices, I think that the dream of buying a house seems more and more distant. :(
7/11/2023	Affordable Housing	I really want to buy a house or condo here but most places are 1.2 million starting for a house or close to it
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing	City could encourage or facilitate matching renters like young people, college students, etc. to home owners who want to rent out a room
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing	How can the City better support new homebuyers, such as requiring developers to allow rental dollars to go toward down payments? Children and their friends are struggling to stay in the Kirkland area due to the steep cost of housing and other basic necessities. NIMBYs do exist, but she thinks that there are too many large, boxy homes.
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing	We need more housing. Do not want to see high rise residential, but rather plan for housing in a more "responsible" manner that compliments current character. SFR have become wildly expensive and rental housing needs to become a greater piece of the conversation. Would like to recognize affordable single-family homes are needed.
4/28/2023	Affordable Housing	Increase number of multifamily housing; lower permit fees; expedite permit review; support HB 1110
4/28/2023	Affordable Housing	City should amend code to require 20% of housing units to be affordable units; make it easier to find housing assistance; how to buy a home; find affordable housing.
	Affordable Housing	It's great that Kirkland is investing in good pedestrian access and better transit options, but it is also imperative that we invest in more housing to keep pace with demand so that people like Mike (who is blind and wants access to affordable housing, better sidewalks, proximity to restaurants, grocery stores, amenities, and public transit,) who stand to benefit the most from those investments can live here and Kirkland doesn't become a walled garden only for extremely wealthy and non-disabled people. The motto of the Kirkland 2044 Comp Plan is "You Belong Here". Let's make sure we're living up to that.
8/21/2024	Affordable Housing	<p>Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility:</p> <p>I am writing you in support of the Kirkland Comprehensive Plan Land Use and specifically its provision for increased housing and transportation-oriented development. I am doing so both as a representative of Washington Physicians for Social Responsibility and as a recently retired physician, who has lived and practiced in your community for 22 years. We lacked sufficient affordable housing when I first moved here, and the problem has only gotten worse. Many of the nurses, techs, and other staff at Evergreen Health, where I practiced, cannot afford to live in Kirkland. The same goes for our teachers, firefighters and many other workers. This results in longer commute times, traffic congestion, and air pollution. Our city remains very attractive to new residents and our local economy is thriving. With housing supply not keeping up with demand, prices continue to escalate, exacerbating economic inequity. There are only 28 affordable homes to rent for every 100 of the lowest income households in Washington. WE need to rapidly increase the housing supply and access to public transportation. Changing our zoning regulations to allow for multifamily units along transportation corridors is absolutely necessary if we are to adequately address the upstream causes of housing insecurity, homelessness, and poor air quality. We also need to ensure that Kirkland residents can access public transportation. Therefore, we also need to plan for walkability and the safety of pedestrians and bicyclists. The health and well-being of Kirkland residents is dependent on a thoughtful approach to long range urban planning that includes affordable housing and safe, easy access to transportation.</p>
7/17/2023	Affordable Housing - Transit	Increase affordable housing within walking distance near Metro Transit routes, frequent service, and need for balance of jobs to affordable housing

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/10/2024	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>I wanted to draw your attention to the Displacement Risk map which was provided in a Density Presentation by Scott Guter to the PLANNING COMMISSION on Aug 8, but not provided to the CITY COUNCIL in a similar presentation on SEPT 3.</p> <p>My impression is the City is desiring to create housing for new residents but not emphasizing assisting current residents to retain housing. My belief is that this is not right.</p> <p>It was recently asked of the City Manager in Council Session, if persons renting in Apartments with low AMI could be given a break on Surface water fees. What is not understood is that persons in Apartments ALREADY pay far less in surface water fees across the board. SFR do not just pay an average fee for surface water management due to the impermeable surface resulting from their house, they THEN pay a disproportionate amount for surface water all throughout town. That is why the City Manager just couldn't come up with that algorithm. They ALL ALREADY get a very nice deal in comparison to SFR. He just did not want to draw attention to that fact.</p> <p>The Presentation detailed out the reason for the Displacement Risk in many of the neighborhoods is "Costs and Fees," they are not hiding it. Disproportionate Costs and Fees is the reason for the Displacement. As an added inconsistency, the 90k zoned density For the Comprehensive Plan is 2/3rds not accessible for persons who cannot access stairs. This make no sense, Kirkland has slightly higher age average than most cities around and like most cities this age factor will increase. Ever higher percentages of person over 50. THIS with MOST NEW UNITS Planned as walk-ups.</p> <p>I guess the hope is that the builders will put in 5 units and one section 8 unit for every new-build. If they do like Toll Bros those units will all be stairs only. BAD PLANNING.</p> <p>Further, that one little 379 respondent ARCH survey upon which ALL THIS NONSENSE IS BASED, was pulled from ALL EAST KING which is about 700,000 persons. That means the survey was only 1/7 of a significant survey sample. This whole thing just gets weirder and weirder.</p> <p>Clearly this City cannot cite necessary changes due to Growth Management Act and ignore HUD laws. The recent reversal of the Chevron Act changes everything. Federal requirements of ADA access will win in court. This, we already know.</p> <p>Please look at the attached Displacement Risk Map from the Planning Commission Aug 8 packet from presentation of the City Planning Commission Rep, Scott Guter.</p>
8/23/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>Kirkland is criminally unaffordable to the all but the 1%. You've built a city for the rich and the people that work in your city can not afford to live here. The criminal use of real estate trading forces people who have lived here their entire life to leave. Empty million dollar homes are everywhere yet there are no options for the 99% of people who work here. Your policy's have forced the public to die on the streets but you end up shipping all the homeless to Seattle instead of fixing the problem. Your actions have told the world that Kirkland hates poor people (especially minorities) and if you work here you don't deserve to live.</p>
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>There are a lot of barriers for many people to be able to live in Kirkland, and how can we advocate on behalf of those who are marginalized and reduce NIMBYs and residents that feel they have special status? Community character will need to change.</p>
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>Refugees who have a lot of contributions to make to the community cannot afford housing in Kirkland, and they have to commute to the IMAN Center for up to 1.5 hours from other towns.</p>
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>How can we ensure better quality control of both new and old buildings to ensure they are mold and chemical free? Even with Section 8 vouchers, there is nothing available locally in Kirkland. Vouchers cannot be used for homes on wheels. Has a unique situation, and would like the City to think outside the box for people like her. She is looking for a lot where she could park a home on wheels.</p>
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>Moved to Kirkland in 1996. Both she and partner had well-paying jobs and bought a house for 1-1.5x their annual salary. Today, it would cost 5x their salary to afford a home of the same size. Has been helping folks use their housing vouchers in the Kirkland area. Sees how expensive it is to move into a place. Is now standard practice to require \$300 to hold an apartment while doing background checks. We need to become denser so that a wide variety of folks can live in Kirkland</p>
6/6/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>Some landlords blatantly discriminate against those who have Section 8 vouchers (some landlords say they won't rent to them, which is illegal). Can the City enforce equal treatment?</p>
6/6/2023	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>More support for low-income renters is needed so they can continue to live in Kirkland.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
	Affordable Housing - Equity/Low Income	<p>I've been living in my vehicle for 11 years. I've heard people refer to Van life, etc, as houseless as opposed to homeless. I think fundamental need is more along the line of food and warmth. As a houseless person, sometimes we don't have warmth, because we don't have access to any electricity. A person could do well with a very small living space, not necessarily a house, as long as we have food and warmth. I know that sounds minimalistic, but honestly, I know a lot of people who moved into housing after living in their vehicle, and they were also very cold because they couldn't afford to turn the heat on. I've known people who were in housing who had to seclude themselves to one room in the house or apartment in order to stay warm.</p> <p>Add to that, they didn't have money for food because their income went all to rent. Currently that's my situation. I very recently, (after 8 1/2 years of living in a parking lot,) received assistance to pay first and last month's rent on a spot; \$600. After the two months is up, every penny I have is going toward that rental spot, and I will have no money for food, gas, medications, doctor appointments, toiletries, etc.</p> <p>The insanity of this is, when I had a voucher, they would cover up to \$1,800 with me only having to pay \$450 a month. Because my trailer is on wheels, they won't even help me with \$600 much less the difference. So come I very likely will wind up back in my van on the street after 2 months, because I need food, medications, gas money. Asking humans to change is a big request. I can't think of what could be asked of people in the area of change. But I do know that people will be more receptive to changing if they know what they might receive as a benefit in return. There might be something that has to be offered as a benefit, otherwise it feels more like corralling someone to do something against their will and or better good.</p> <p>If nothing tangible can be offered, then perhaps at least some policies could be put in place to protect against either real or misperceived threats, disadvantages, or even losses.</p>
8/31/2023	Affordable Housing - First Responders	Housing incentives to support first responders living in the community. Affordable housing to welcome people from a broad socio-economic spectrum.
6/13/2023	Affordable Housing - Renters Rights	He is a renter in the Velocity building near the South Kirkland Park and Ride. A quarter of the units in the Velocity building are affordable, but he lives in a market rate unit with his partner. His landlord would not give him a guaranteed 2-year lease and cited a city policy from the 70s. His partner and him have 1 car between them and neither drive to work. They use transit or bike. If he was to move to a place that they could afford in Kirkland, both him and his partner would need to drive and shoulder the cost of gas. Have looked at buying homes in a similar size to their current rental, but the price would be 100K a year.
7/18/2023	Affordable Housing - Transit (Renter)	Allowing Mixed commercial/residential Midrises in the Metro Transit Walkshed is the most obvious way to reduce the car dependent nature of the community. Dense housing within walking distance of transit and Relevant Commercial zones reduces the total trips necessary this will improve traffic and assist the regional homelessness crisis.
7/17/2023	Affordable Housing - Transit (Renter)	<p>New to Kirkland. Consider these points and represent them in the plan (summarized):</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Kirkland, needs more housing. If the city is projecting job growth, it needs commensurate housing growth.</li> <li>2. Allow for denser construction within a short 5-10 minute walk from transit.</li> <li>3. Encourage construction of affordable and sustainable housing. Prioritize permitting. Create zoning overlay created for just this goal.</li> <li>4. Downtown/Moss Bay and Totem Lake, needs greater walkability and reduced car traffic. Pedestrianize Park Lane, create east-west foot and bike corridor, and buildnew pedestrian scramble on Lake Street. Simple traffic calming devices such as speed tables and chicanes could go a long, long way to making life safer for pedestrians, cyclists, and wheelchair users.</li> </ol>
4/17/2024	Affordable Housing - Zoning Code	<p>On behalf of several residential developers submitted ideas to generate additional housing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-consider cash contribution and other alternatives for developers to meet affordable housing requirements</li> <li>-extend timing of MFTE credit from 8 years to 12 or 20 years</li> <li>-allow flexible ground floor retail requirements</li> <li>-expand NE 85th ST zoning between 128th-132nd Ave to allow 5 stories</li> <li>-Revise Kirklands AMI percents (vs King County's) to be more relevant to Kirkland's high land and development costs</li> <li>-Relax FAR and lot coverage requirements for middle housing</li> <li>-Reduce permit review times by issuing a permitting schedule with application submittal; or provide external permit review</li> </ul>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
12/6/2023	Affordable Housing/Parking/Land Use/Transportation	<p>With the 2044 Comprehensive Plan on the horizon, I am writing to express my concern about the parking minimums in our city. I believe that these minimums are unnecessarily high and are in direct opposition to the stated goals of the city of Kirkland.</p> <p>I would like to suggest reducing or even eliminating parking minimums in our city. This would accomplish a number of goals:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Reduce housing costs and increase affordable housing</li> <li>- Reduce reliance on single occupancy vehicles and increase active transportation and transit usage</li> <li>- Promote the redevelopment of parking spaces into businesses and housing</li> <li>- Support small businesses and the local economy</li> </ul> <p>A small excerpt from our parking code:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Attached Dwelling Units: 2.0 per dwelling unit</li> <li>- 1.2 per studio unit. 1.3 per 1 bedroom unit. 1.6 per 2 bedroom unit. 1.8 per 3 or more bedroom unit.</li> <li>- Restaurant or tavern: 1 per each 100 sq. ft. of gross floor area.</li> <li>- If the required number of parking spaces results in a fraction, the applicant shall provide the number of spaces equal to the next higher whole number.</li> </ul>
10/7/2024	Apartments	<p>Thank you so much for the detailed planning that you lead in our Kirkland City Government. I am interested in the future of Kirkland, and I especially enjoy the planning meetings you coordinate to inform us Kirkland residents of the planning process that is ongoing. Moreover, we have lived in our home on 9th Avenue since 2010, so we have seen the Kirkland planning process go full circle from planning to realization and beyond.</p> <p>The look and the feel of Kirkland is one of the many reasons that we decided to move from the Washington D.C. area (Fairfax, VA) to Kirkland for our retirement. We paid more than double what we netted from our Fairfax home to buy our Kirkland home. My wife likes to travel, but after 26 years of traveling courtesy of the United States Navy, I can think of no better place in the world to be than Kirkland, other than perhaps heaven.</p> <p>In that spirit I offer the following thoughts for the planning board's consideration:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Apartments can be a trap for their residents. By far the greatest multiplier of our wealth has been our real estate. We have owned our Kirkland residence for over 14 years. It has appreciated about double what our life-long investments in stock has.</li> <li>2. Apartment living is transitional. We have lived in apartments, moving in and out of areas. We were not as involved in the communities as we are in Kirkland. Home owners are typically more permanent and involved in the community.</li> <li>3. Apartments placed wrongly can destroy the unique Kirkland atmosphere that draws an increasingly educated, skilled, and prosperous workforce. Apartment dwellers can move up the income scale or not.</li> <li>4. If the economy falters because the unique flavor of Kirkland is destroyed, future improvements will be stifled.</li> </ol> <p>As I stated at the Norkirk meeting on October 2, 2024 I have great faith in you, our planning board and the Kirkland City Council to do the right thing. Please let me know of anything I can do to support you.</p>
6/5/2023	Communication/Outreach	<p>Does city publish the results of these surveys? Where can we see those? Does city publish the results of these surveys? Where can we see those?</p>
	Communication/Outreach	<p>Question #2: Besides the internet, there are several methods the City can use to improve information sharing:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Mailings: Sending out physical mailings can reach residents who may not have internet access or prefer offline communication.</li> <li>b) Radio: Utilizing local radio stations can help disseminate information to a broader audience, particularly those who listen to the radio regularly.</li> <li>c) Newspapers: Placing advertisements or publishing articles in local newspapers can reach people who rely on traditional print media for news.</li> <li>d) Posting on bulletin boards: Sharing information on community bulletin boards in public spaces, such as libraries, community centers, and local businesses, can help increase visibility.</li> <li>e) Open house sessions: Organizing open house sessions or community meetings where residents can directly engage with city officials and ask questions can foster better communication and information sharing.</li> <li>f) Translating materials and providing interpretation: Ensuring information is available in multiple languages and providing interpretation services during meetings and events can help reach a more diverse population and improve accessibility.</li> </ol>
9/4/2024	Density	<p>I strongly oppose the construction of large multi-family homes in our picturesque family neighborhoods. Introducing dense housing developments in these areas not only disrupts the character and charm of our communities but also disproportionately harms lower-income families. These developments often lead to increased property taxes, higher living costs, and strain on local infrastructure, making it harder for long-term residents to afford their homes. Moreover, it's concerning that some public representatives seem more interested in the profits generated by increasing housing density than in listening to the voices of their constituents. We need leaders who prioritize the well-being of our communities over the interests of developers.</p>



## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/20/2024	Density	As a kirkland homeowner, I want to see the city add housing much faster. Much more housing than currently envisioned in the plan update is needed. I'd like to see a tripling of our population by 2044. When we build a sustainable 0 carbon city many people will want to live here and we should accommodate that. To each carbon the goal should be that most residents do not store or regularly use cars and that should be reflected in new builds and new city infrastructure.
5/23/2024	Design Review Process	Reconsider the value that the design review process has when compared to providing more livable space and affordable housing.
10/10/2024	General	I support all of Vice Chair Heiser's sensible and proposed amendments. I strongly support and advise fiscal accountable to tax payers. I recommend that the Council & Planning Commission clearly discuss recommendations from residents. I support city council members and planning commission members who acknowledge and incorporate the contributions of current Kirkland residents.
9/26/2024	General	I've lived in the same house in Kirkland for 46 years. I'm a professional working in Kirkland. I'm concerned about the Too Much. Too Soon. Too Fast. approach that is in the works. Studies on change demonstrate the consequences of Too Much. Too Soon. Too Fast often results in chaos, anxiety, mistakes, uncertainty, division, depression and yes, even trauma. To Planning Commission, Staff and City Council I ask you, Slow Down. You Move Too Fast. I support controlled creative growth. I do not support increasing residential capacity and housing choice in residential neighborhoods by promoting the redevelopment of public lands for affordable smaller manufactured homes, including mobile homes. I support a quality of life that includes community spirit and connection through out it's green spaces, parks, wet lands and wide open skies.
9/26/2024	General	The affordable housing numbers are laudable goals but totally unrealistic. The PSH goals are a huge stretch. This chapter proposes an astonishing number of changes (50 policies; K2035 Housing chapter has 17 policies). And no discussion of how those impacts will be absorbed/mitigated. Kirkland is taking on an outsized share of the affordable housing need and housing density. Where is the focus on seniors (age 65+)?? This is really late in the game for the public to be seeing a draft of this important chapter.
9/26/2024	General	I am writing to speak to the housing crisis here in Kirkland...unless someone has a very well-paying job, they cannot afford to live here in Kirkland...long commutes through our neighborhoods are mentally exhausting, generate traffic through our streets, pollute our environment, and put pressure on undeveloped land on the outskirts of our neighboring cities...when we fail to build housing it impacts our entire region. When wealthy families are priced out of Kirkland, they move further away from their jobs and drive up the prices in nearby cities...as long as we are adding to our housing stock, we are keeping pressure off the prices of older, more affordable housing...Increasing housing supply is an effective and well-studied way to slow the growth of regional housing costs in the long term...With the update to the housing element, we have the opportunity to learn from the mistakes of our peers. We have the opportunity to plan for the change that is already here. And we have the opportunity to welcome in our new neighbors, rather than trying to hold the door shut behind us.
9/26/2024	General	Centering affordable housing, equitable growth, and regional responsibility in the housing element matters to me. I support more housing and affordable housing in Kirkland. It's NOT okay that people who work and contribute in Kirkland have to drive long distances when we can explore solutions. It's NOT okay that many children who go to school in Kirkland will not have a reasonable chance to live here as adults. Please set a bold vision for housing that is aligned with our stated values: inclusive and equitable community, affordability, and abundant housing options. Please center affordability in the Housing Element. I support policies that contribute to affordability and maintain affordable housing in Kirkland, such as: increased funding, increased residential capacity and housing choice, enhanced city-wide inclusionary zoning requirements (Policy H-1.2), etc. Growth in Kirkland should happen in other areas of the city as well as Urban Centers. I support H-2.2 to "ensure that affordable housing opportunities at a variety of income levels are not concentrated but are available throughout the city and especially in walkable areas with good access to transit, employment, parks, and neighborhood-serving retail, especially grocery stores.
9/26/2024	General	In respect to the housing discussion and more specifically the public/private partnership component, I understand an Amazon-backed project The Grata recently opened in Totem Lake with 125 affordable units. I applaud the effort by Amazon to help Kirkland, which brings me to my next point. In looking at other partnerships, there appears to be nothing locally from Kirkland's Google. Google has been in the city since 2004 and now two decades later they employ some 7,200 workers in the state. The impact of these workers and their families cannot be underestimated on our community. There is a disconnect between this corporate partner and its citizens. The city's inability to keep up with the influx has shown through in impacted roadways and public resource at capacity. Community programs at full capacity with waitlists and lack of a year-round indoor pool just to name a few. This is a prime opportunity for Google to put forth financial support for our local housing needs, as well as brand a new community center/pool and make a real difference in the lives of citizens.
9/26/2024	General	I am a longtime resident of Kirkland and oppose increasing residential capacity in Kirkland neighborhoods. I believe the impact of these decisions could negatively impact the people who call this community our home from increased traffic, crime, overcrowding. Me, my family and my neighbors say NO to hyper urbanization of kirkland!

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/26/2024	General	Our family has lived in the same house in Kirkland for 5 years. But I've lived in other parts of Kirkland for much longer than that. I grew up in Monroe, and always loved coming to Kirkland. It's always been my dream to make it home. And in 2019, we purchased our first home and made it a reality. We love this city for many reasons, but most of all, it's a safe, quiet, place to raise a family. We love the parks, we love the cute shops, we love the quiet, neighborhoods, we love the trees, and we love the overall character of this beloved town. We DO NOT support the hyper-urbanization that is in the works. We would have moved to Seattle if that is the environment we wanted. No one I have talked to who actually lives here does. None of my neighbors, none of my friends. We worked hard to make this place our home, and have put in roots here. Please do not ruin this wonderful place. I vehemently oppose increasing residential capacity and housing choice in residential neighborhoods.
9/26/2024	General	In order to judge if we need more density...I would challenge you to try to go to Juanita Beach on a warm sunny day - especially on the weekends. I would challenge you to take 116th west until it turns into Juanita Dr. NE and drive up Finn Hill on any work day during rush hour. I would challenge you to head north on market street from downtown Kirkland during rush hour. I would challenge you to avoid cutting into landowners property to widen roads and add sidewalks in neighborhoods (main roads are reasonable). Putting all Kirkland roads into a 15 year construction zone cycle is a terrible idea.
9/25/2024	General	The Draft Housing Element suggests that PSH, transitional housing, emergency shelters, and similar facilities should be "equitably distributed" and "lands" should be prioritized for production of such facilities. Due to the intentionally reduced barriers relating to personal behaviors and criminal history for admission to PSH, it is not appropriate to site PSH within 2500 feet of schools, day cares, or public parks, or interspersed in primarily residential neighborhoods. Large scale affordable housing should also be concentrated in/near urban centers with easy access to jobs and essential services, including reliable frequent high capacity transit, to maximize access and minimize costs for those households and minimize infrastructure strain. The draft Housing Element calls for using "surplus land," especially parks, schools, and faith-based properties, for "small manufactured homes" and/or mobile homes. It is unclear what is considered "surplus land" or what is meant by "small manufactured homes." Equity and Inclusivity. The draft Housing Element touts that Kirkland adopted inclusionary zoning 15 years ago yet asserts that there are still exclusionary regulations that should be removed from the zoning code. What exactly are those? Kirkland should adopt a balanced approach and grow in areas where infrastructure can support increased density while protecting primarily residential neighborhoods from overdevelopment and crushing congestion.
9/25/2024	General	I do not want increased housing density "near transit" outside of an urban or commercial center. The term "near transit" is too vague and could mean any bus route. I do not want increased housing choices in residential areas through promoting the redevelopment of public lands, such as public parks, schools, churches and green spaces. Other cities like Bellevue and Redmond, do not heavily target residential neighborhoods for this kind of development. Why is Kirkland not following their lead?
9/25/2024	General	There continues to be a significant disparity in pay for women and this impacts their ability to afford housing. How could we not be considering it and calling it out along with race as an issue that we should be paying attention to and mitigating? I thought this was an interesting item to note, that there are currently more 3 to 4 bedroom units than the number of 3 to 4 person households, while the inventory of 1 bedroom units as compared to 1 person households is less. I suspect that is true. However, I'd be cautious before we make efforts to reduce the inventory of 3-4 bedroom units. Just as the number of bedrooms is not necessarily the right
9/25/2024	General	MBAKS letter of concern regarding policy H-1.2. Current language of Policy H-1.2 and encourages consideration of alternative language that would clarify intent and ensure the promotion of middle housing, cottage housing, and ADU construction.
9/25/2024	General	MBAKS letter of support for policies H-1.4, H-1.5, H-1.6, H-1.12, H-1.13, H-1.18, and H-2.2.

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	General	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding some of the policies proposed in the Draft Housing Element. I understand and appreciate the need to address housing affordability and homelessness, but it is crucial to balance these goals with the interests and well-being of existing residents in our residential neighborhoods. The recent adoption of the Totem Lake Neighborhood Plan allows the ParMac CAR to proceed with study and review, which seeks to rezone multiple parcels in TL 10D zone to allow for mixed-use/high-density residential uses. According to the CAR, the proposed mixed-use buildings would be up to 18 stories high as tiered towers depending on their setback from the adjacent single-family homes. I am not only concerned because this is immediately behind my house, but also because we have already seen that the construction of The Pine apartments negatively impacted our home value – when we sought to sell this past summer, we received no offers because of the apartments behind our house. From a less person standpoint, there are other concerns regarding putting this type of density in this area.</p> <p>1) There are no public transportation options within a ¼ mile from the property. While there is a bike lane, steep inclines along Forbes Creek Drive and Market Street would almost necessitate e-Bikes if this mode of transportation were to be accessible to most people. A map of bus service in this area shows that Forbes Creek Drive is currently only serviced by the 893 bus line, which only goes to Lake Washington High School between 7 and 8 am during the school year. Any other bus lines that previously existed in this area have been eliminated. Residents of the Pine and The Preserve at Forbes Creek are already forced to rely on cars because no other bus lines service this area and the bus stops for regular bus lines are not within a reasonable walking distance. Allowing for up to 1200 more apartment units at the ParMac site with no transportation infrastructure in place in this area would be irresponsible. The city of Kirkland does not dictate bus lines and bus schedules and there is no guarantee that this area will ever have suitable bus service. As it stands now, it is a nightmare getting in and out of the 116th St/124th Ave area near 405 during rush hour. The infrastructure cannot support such high density. When I met with Council Member Jon Pascal at my home so that he could see the area, he also expressed reservations about the lack of infrastructure to support the density being proposed at the ParMac site.</p> <p>2) We recently received a mailing with the Forbes Creek Report Card: <a href="https://www.kirklandwa.gov/files/sharedassets/public/v/1/public-works/surface-water/watershed-report-cards/2024-forbes-creek-report-card.pdf">https://www.kirklandwa.gov/files/sharedassets/public/v/1/public-works/surface-water/watershed-report-cards/2024-forbes-creek-report-card.pdf</a>  The health of Forbes Creek is now at Moderate Concern and has dropped 12 points since 2022. Sockeye, cutthroat trout, coho salmon, stickleback, dace and lamprey have been documented in Forbes Creek. Construction of The Pine began in 2021 and woodlands are being cleared along Forbes Creek Drive to allow for the construction of new cottages. I can't help but wonder to what extent the construction of The Pine contributed to negatively impacting the health of the creek. Construction is also going on along the corridor trail for the new Cross Kirkland Townes, which will also likely impact the health of the creek. Before allowing development of ParMac to allow for 1,200 new apartments, we must consider how current construction in this area is already Forbes Creek and what further construction would likely do. A full environmental impact study must be done.</p> <p>3) In a previous e-mail, I listed all of the businesses currently located at the ParMac site, which face be risk of being forced out of the area if the CAR is allowed to proceed: Decorus: a woman/immigrant owned staging company (Decorus Home Staging - Home Staging Refined)  Airefco: a wholesale HVAC supplier (Airefco HVAC Products   HVAC Solutions &amp; Support   Airefco)  Relief Factor: a vitamin and supplement distributor (Relief Factor Co. Celebrating 10 Years of 100% Drug-Free Wellness)</p>
9/24/2024	General	<p>I want to commend you all on the latest draft of the Housing Element. I think the vision statement clearly articulates the key priorities of our city and the challenges it faces. It's been pointed out that we have enough housing capacity to meet the total housing unit target, but the Housing Capacity Analysis clearly shows that we have a much greater demand for affordable housing than our current policies are likely to support. We can't "wait and see" just because it's theoretically possible that we build enough affordable housing with our current policies. We need to take action now to ensure that housing is built that can actually help our under-served communities, and the housing element makes this urgency clear.</p> <p>I support the city's holistic approach to ensure that affordable housing is built in the most appropriate places, and not just shoved into a corner. Affordable and supportive housing needs to be built in the most fiscally responsible way, and that generally means where infrastructure and services exist. These projects must be integrated into the rest of the community to allow for upward mobility and to make Kirkland a truly welcoming and inclusive city. We can't achieve that vision by creating economic segregation.</p> <p>One thing I'd like to raise about the Housing Element is that it's unclear what "public lands" means in Policy H-2.10. I assume that means "use land the city owns for housing", but I feel it's quite easy to interpret that as "they're going to take away our parks and open space for shelters".</p> <p>The Housing Inventory was also a very interesting and informative read.</p> <p>There's too much to say in this email really, but Figure 37 stood out in particular. It shows that Kirkland's ratio of housing:jobs is starting to drop, meaning that we're projected to add more housing than jobs.</p> <p>While the next figure implies that this shouldn't be a huge deal, I think it's worthy of concern. A changing ration would further increase competition for market rate housing in the city, raising prices. This is a less dire issue than our need for Affordable housing, but it could still be very damaging to our community members who don't qualify for as much support but could be priced out. I look forward to seeing the new housing inventory analysis mentioned in the memo for this Thursday's public hearing. I also look forward to seeing how the city takes action to fulfill the policies in this comp plan in the next few years.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/23/2024	General	<p>I am writing as a concerned resident who values the unique character and sense of community that Kirkland has fostered over the years. While I understand the need for growth, I urge you to reject specific policies in the proposed Kirkland Housing Element that would allow for excessive densification in our neighborhoods and open spaces—places where many of us have built our lives, raised our families, and connected with our neighbors.</p> <p>As former mayor Penny Sweet suggested in 2020, Kirkland has always been a city that balances growth with quality of life. Our parks, open spaces, and residential neighborhoods make this community so cherished. The city should follow the lead of Bellevue and Redmond, where growth has been responsibly concentrated in Urban Centers rather than spreading into established residential areas. If the policies below are implemented, we risk losing what makes Kirkland feel like home.</p> <p>Policy H-1.4: Increasing residential development intensity in areas with existing infrastructure and services might seem logical, but the impact would be significant for those of us living in these neighborhoods. Increased traffic, noise, and overcrowded services would change the very fabric of the community that drew many of us here in the first place.</p> <p>Policy H-1.7 and Policy H-1.9: These policies prioritize the development of Permanent Supportive Housing (PSH) in residential areas. While PSH is an important goal, placing these facilities in our neighborhoods could overwhelm local services and diminish the sense of safety and community value. We need PSH to be located in areas with better access to the resources and infrastructure necessary to support these residents, such as urban centers, rather than in residential neighborhoods where services are strained.</p> <p>Policy H-1.10: While I support the creation of affordable housing, incentivizing faith-based or non-profit organizations to develop such housing in residential areas could lead to the over-densification of these neighborhoods, eroding the community spaces that serve as gathering spots for families and friends. Losing these spaces to housing development would be a loss for everyone in Kirkland.</p> <p>Policy H-1.12: While this policy prioritizes growth in urban and commercial centers, the vague language could lead to unintended consequences for our residential areas. We need to ensure that growth remains where it is planned—in areas designed to handle it—so that our neighborhoods can retain their character and function.</p> <p>Policy H-2.10: This policy supports the use of surplus land for affordable housing, but surplus land often includes parks, open spaces, and lands used by the community. These are the places where children play, families gather, and nature thrives. Repurposing these spaces for housing would be a long-term loss for the community. As a parent (or community member), I value walking with my family to a park that isn't overcrowded to enjoy the open spaces that help make Kirkland livable. I ask that you preserve these spaces for future generations. We agree that growth is needed, but growth should not come at the expense of what makes Kirkland a desirable place to live. By rejecting these policies, you will protect the balance of development and quality of life Kirkland has worked hard to achieve. We support responsible growth in Urban Centers and middle housing, but please help protect the integrity of our neighborhoods and open spaces. Thank you for your attention to this matter and your efforts to ensure Kirkland grows wisely and sustainably.</p>
9/22/2024	General	<p>After reading your 2044 Housing Element online, it seems to me that eventually Kirkland City planners will want to establish YIMBY (Yes in My Back Yard). It would be a serious mistake as it has already been done in California and failed to help the lower income people. Instead it hurt the lower and middle income households and benefitted the "RICH" exactly what was NOT intended! Meritocracy, although not perfect, is still the best system we have!</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/19/2024	General	<p>I have been following the development of Kirkland's 2044 Comprehensive Plan as well as the feedback the Council has received. The pushback on the Plan is not rooted in resistance to Kirkland city growth, but rather concerns on how the growth is executed. The Plan looks to add nearly \$10 billion of additional real estate to Kirkland. This growth will impact every aspect of how we live and work. Simply put, there is a lot at stake. I'd like to lend my perspective as an expert in my field. I have over 20 years of corporate finance and public accounting experience as well as nearly 20 years of experience as an adjunct university professor where I teach graduate level courses in both governmental accounting as well as taxation. I attribute my career success to my ability to develop accurate long-range plans and develop precise models for complex business problems. After carefully reading the 2044 Comprehensive Plan, I don't see how the goals of this plan as current written can be accomplished without a meaningful negative impact to all current and future residents of Kirkland. Background: These negative financial consequences stem from how affordable housing is funded and restrictions on property tax levies. To encourage developers to build the types of housing we need, Kirkland is one of many cities that offer a multifamily tax exemption (MFTE) given to properties that have affordable housing. Depending on the number of affordable housing units offered (10-30%), the MFTE waives property taxes between 8 to 20 years [1]. Additionally, traffic, park and school impact fees may be waived [2]. The ability to make up for the loss of city revenue is limited under RCW 84.55.010, where the total amount of property tax levies can only increase by 1% each year excluding the value of new construction [3]. Given the growth targets outlined in the Plan, combined with the lengthy MFTE, the effects will be felt for years to come. The negative financial consequences will materialize in all three of the following ways: 1. Tax shift resulting in an increase of property tax to existing residents: Because a tax paying dwelling is replaced with a tax-exempt dwelling, the total amount of property tax has to be shared among fewer units [4]. 2. Direct tax increase tax to existing residents: If the new dwelling qualifies as new construction, the value of construction is added on top to the total amount of property tax to be levied. For perspective, in 2024, new construction added 1% additional property tax to be levied [5]. In short, there is more property taxes to be collected, but to be split among fewer tax paying dwellings. This new amount of levy carries over to become the basis for the following year. 3. Reduction in service level and quality of government provided services: Multifamily dwellings have a lower assessed property value on a per person basis [6]. Because the assessed value of new construction is added on top of the property levy, the ratio of tax to people will be reduced. The outcome is that the amount of property tax collected will grow at a significantly slower rate than the population. This issue is further exacerbated by the waiver of impact fees. Impact fees are used to pay for critical capital improvements, incremental expansion and added infrastructure for parks, schools and traffic to accommodate the increase in population [7]. It is unlikely that the City's revenue shortage can be made up through other means such as sales tax or federal funding. New residents will not generate more sales tax revenue per person, as current sales tax revenue hasn't even kept pace with inflation rates [8],[9],[10]. This means if you believe that the city's population is growing (growth rates vary dramatically based on source), we're receiving less on a per person basis. Moreover, federal programs like the \$5.5 billion in funding recently announced by the Biden/Harris administration are unlikely to provide relief for Kirkland's Plan. The federal programs are largely aimed at increasing home ownership through cheaper houses faster to market and provide rental vouchers and emergency shelter for those unlikely to buy a house [11],[12]. These goals, while not at odds with the Plan, aim to solve the housing crises in a multifaceted approach that differs from Kirkland's Plan. Further, some of these federal programs even require community additional investment [13]. There are only a handful of options available to the City ensure there is not a material degradation of government services provided to the community: a. <del>The City Council can eliminate the MFTE and waiver of impact fees. This option ensures there is enough</del></p>
5/23/2024	General	<p>Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife comments: We strongly recommend incorporating Low Impact Development policies within this element. Also require all housing to retain or create open space opportunities that are adjacent and connected to other open spaces. This can be done by demonstrating consideration for this within site plans, to the greatest extent feasible.</p>
	General	<p>Question #3: To better reach renters and increase their engagement in civic processes, the City can consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Outreach programs: Implement targeted outreach programs specifically designed to engage renters, such as hosting meetings in areas with a high concentration of rental properties.</li> <li>b) Online platforms: Utilize online platforms, such as social media and dedicated websites, to share information and provide opportunities for renters to participate in discussions and provide feedback.</li> <li>c) Partnerships with property owners/managers: Collaborate with property owners/managers to disseminate information to tenants and encourage their participation in civic processes.</li> </ul>
10/10/2024	General	<p>I support all of Vice Chair Heiser's sensible and proposed amendments.  I strongly support and advise fiscal accountable to tax payers.  I recommend that the Council &amp; Planning Commission clearly discuss recommendations from residents.  I support city council members and planning commission members who acknowledge and incorporate the contributions of current Kirkland residents.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
10/10/2024	General	<p>I live in Kirkland and I wish to express my concerns regarding some of the policies proposed in the Draft Housing Element. We do not want Transit Corridors, disorganized density, or unchecked permanent supportive housing pushed into our residential neighborhoods. We want coordinated, sustainable growth in urban and neighborhood centers, a rational implementation of Middle Housing, and Responsible Growth with Adequate Infrastructure and Transparent Decision-Making. The recently introduced wording regarding areas within a half mile walk of a "full service grocery store" came out of left field. We all love the fantasy of the little village with its butcher, baker, produce market, etc. But half a mile is a wide swath of development. It is simply another way of increasing areas eligible for development. Did someone think the residents of Kirkland wouldn't notice that having turned away the Transit Corridors, that someone decided to approach from a different direction with the same goal? I understand and appreciate the need to address housing affordability, but it is crucial to balance these goals with the interests and well-being of existing residents in our residential neighborhoods. Existing residents are the bread and butter (or pita and hummus, or rice and fish) of our community. While the established population may not be as sexy and exciting as the potential new residents you hope to attract (Kirkland 90210?), we already fund the community and value relationships with our neighbors. We chose Kirkland to reside in because of its neighborhood character. Much like in a marriage, it is one thing to grow and change together, and another for one party to desire to change the other nearly out of recognition (in which case, someone else should have been chosen to begin with). I.e., if you patronize a Thai restaurant (suburban Kirkland), don't try to convince the chef that he should be cooking Italian food (urban Bellevue), because you prefer it, or think it should be cheaper to produce. Go to an Italian restaurant to begin with. To put it yet another way, people desire to live in Kirkland because of its beauty, human scale, green spaces, lake views, friendly neighborhoods with sidewalks, assortment of restaurants and small shops. Don't institute the density equivalent of a Denny Regrade over all of Kirkland (except you'd be building high boxes instead of sluicing down hills). Don't sandblast the uniqueness of Kirkland into a featureless, homogenous space in the service of shoehorning in as many people as possible. We can increase housing options in appropriate, already designated urban development areas without coring the heart of our apples/neighborhoods out. Retain much of the Comprehensive Plan already in place. It was carefully crafted. Develop 85th as higher density. Develop Totem Lake. Put higher density housing where there are specifically planned transit, road capacity and human resources available. Have you tried driving through Houghton at 3:30pm? NE 68th St is already in gridlock from Met Market to the freeway. Adding a ton of high density housing there will make it almost impassible. A water line has a fixed capacity; trying to shove more water through it simply increases the pressure and likelihood of a blowout. We can't control what Metro will do regarding our transit. Don't place dense housing where people will be marooned if it's not peak transit hours, hoping that transit will come in future. Putting a bus lane on part of 108th would further screw up traffic flow, much like all the merges in the Renton S curves. It's 1similar to removing a small culvert for salmon without looking further upstream to see if there are bigger ones in the way that make removing the small one moot. Then you've wasted the resources. One of my primary concerns is the potential impact of increased housing density on the character and safety of our neighborhoods. Many of us chose to live in these areas due to the sense of community, safety, and access to essential services such as available capacity in neighborhood schools, adequate parking, and fire and police services. Our infrastructure is already being strained. Some areas have low water pressure (NorKirk, Highlands), making fire fighting difficult if multiple structures become involved. This is not safe. Adding considerable density requires upgrading infrastructure first. How would we increase school capacity without losing quality of education? <u>You can't just add a ton of students and workload and expect teachers to pick up the slack. Roads are already maxed out. Road rage makes for bad</u></p>
9/29/2024	General	<p>I am a Kirkland resident, and I am writing to ask you a few questions regarding the housing element in the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. These questions have also been asked by other Kirkland residents through comments during the public hearing. I am including links to the videos from the public hearing in the hope that these concerns are given serious and sincere consideration, as they are very important to us—the people who live, pay taxes, and vote in Kirkland. Housing Goals: Is there any consequence for not hitting the housing targets? Where are we getting these numbers? Why is Kirkland willingly accepting/committing to delivering density for King County while Kirkland is already the third most dense city in the state of Washington and is running low on resources? Who are we trying to appease here? Why are the hopes, needs, and wants of the current residents of Kirkland not being considered? These questions were also asked by another Kirkland resident (<a href="https://youtu.be/A4a3b9YEbr4">https://youtu.be/A4a3b9YEbr4</a>, <a href="https://youtu.be/tGulem54_lc">https://youtu.be/tGulem54_lc</a>), and I am sure several other residents have the same questions. It would help if you could clarify these for us current residents. Tax Implications: How is the city planning to deal with the tax implications of building affordable housing on the current residents of Kirkland? I am afraid that making housing affordable for some people might make it unaffordable for the elders and seniors in the area who are on fixed incomes and have been living in their homes for years. You can hear more about this from a resident who has expertise in this domain (<a href="https://youtu.be/9XZZuxHpA8">https://youtu.be/9XZZuxHpA8</a>). It would be great if you could provide some insights and clarifications on the points I've made above. Please also consider this as my expression of opposition to the Housing Element that's currently part of the 2044 Comprehensive Plan.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/28/2024	General	<p>I hope this email finds you well. I am writing to inquire if the city has conducted any economic analysis to measure the impact of affordable housing and new developments on the future property taxes of current residents. If such a study exists, could you please direct me to where I can access it? I understand there are plans to introduce 13,200 affordable housing units supported by taxpayers. Given that these are based on the MFTE model, I anticipate that we might see up to 75,000 additional units benefiting from significant tax reductions. This raises concerns that current residents may have to bear the financial burden. Could you provide projections for property tax increases for single-family homes in Kirkland if these urbanization goals are achieved? Do you believe Kirkland will remain affordable for current residents, or will the new taxes force them out of their homes to accommodate these new luxury developments (with 10-20% subsidized to be affordable)? If no economic studies have been conducted, or if the results are unfavorable, I urge you to delay further action until a thorough economic study is completed. As public servants, you are responsible for the well-being of all Kirkland residents, above the interests of those seeking to move here. While I appreciate that our city provides job opportunities to people from other areas, I do not believe we are obligated to house them. For many years, I commuted from Edmonds to Redmond. After moving to Kirkland, I continued to work in Redmond and Bothell, and my neighbors work in Everett, Kent, and Redmond. We are grateful for the job opportunities provided by these cities, but it would be unreasonable to expect them to provide us subsidised housing closer to our workplaces. Similarly, if Kirkland is too far for some workers, they should seek employment that better suits their lifestyle. At the Thursday City planning Commission meeting, Advocacy groups pushing for the urbanization of Kirkland often argue that some current residents believe there is a limited “goodness” in Kirkland that we are afraid will run out. However, the concerns of residents are not about “goodness” but about the infrastructure and economic impacts on their livelihoods.</p>
9/25/2024	General	<p>I am writing as a concerned resident who has valued my 24 years in Kirkland with children in our public schools. While I recognize the importance of growth, I urge you to carefully review the proposed land use policies. Our city is already meeting its growth targets and should not commit to adding more housing units. I have outlined several comments on the land use policies that I believe are not beneficial.</p> <p><del>Housing is fundamental to everyone's life. It's where you live, how you live, and what gives you a sense of security in the world. While growth is important</del></p>
9/26/2024	General	<p>I support a future of housing abundance in Kirkland and I support an urgent pathway to get there in the final version of the 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I support the Housing Element and believe Kirkland should go as far as possible to provide housing for all ages, wages, and stages of life. All neighborhoods should do their part in accepting new housing and at the same time we should maximize housing abundance near transit and other amenities such as schools, shops, parks, daycares, businesses, etc. Increasing the supply of housing is a wildly popular objective and housing abundance draws support from both sides of the aisle...please include explicit support for single-stair buildings in the Housing Element. Single-stair multifamily buildings with reduced or no parking are the most affordable, sustainable, and liveable middle housing option and are the best solution to achieving our goal of providing more housing units that are affordable to households with incomes at or below 80 percent of the area median income (AMI). These buildings also scale up very nicely where denser building styles are needed to achieve housing abundance.</p>
5/22/2024	Growth targets/housing	<p>The City seems to think it needs to solve the housing needs for all of King County and/or the greater region. If every community in the region is doing its part, the housing needs will be met. Kirkland is and always has been well ahead of its growth targets as set by PSRC. Yet the city is insisting it needs to do more. Why? The recently released 2023 census numbers show that Kirkland's population is actually on the decline - decreased ~1.1% from 2022. The City acknowledges that even under the existing zoning and land use policies, Kirkland has the capacity to far exceed its 2044 growth targets.</p>
9/9/2023	Homeless Encampments	<p>Zoning Code amendments are needed to KZC 127 for homeless encampments to extend time and other changes. See email</p>
5/21/2024	Housing	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Do not add requirements that make housing more expensive, such as mandating recreational areas in large complexes as I heard in the previous public hearing.</li> <li>2. Enable to the fullest extent possible the creation of housing density within walksheds of transit corridors which will both increase housing stock and help justify increased transit, which we desperately need. Take a hard look at pushing past the 50 dwelling units per acre ceiling in order to expand housing options, including apartments, along these corridors.</li> <li>3. Eliminate barriers to building more homes of all types sprinkled throughout the city. Specifically, though not exhaustively: <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Do away with Design Review or severely streamline it</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Increase height limits and reduce setbacks</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce minimum lot sizes</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Reduce costly permit review time</li> <li><input type="checkbox"/> Eliminate parking requirements, not just reduce or restructure</li> </ul> </li> <li>4. When you “explore” increasing allowances for small-scale neighborhood commercial uses and home-based businesses think expansively rather than restrictively. Being able to access day-to-day needs and other services within walking distance from home is important on so many levels, including community cohesion and sustainability.</li> </ol>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
8/19/2024	Housing Availability	<p>The 2044 plan conflates housing availability with housing prices. I think you would agree that the city has added a significant number of housing units over the past 5 years, and there's a fairly deep pipeline of projects underway to bring even more housing online. I think you would also agree that housing prices in Kirkland have not gone down. They haven't even stabilized. Please don't destroy our neighborhoods based on a strategy that has not been effective. The fact is, there are a lot of high-income folks in the area that are willing to pay very high prices to live in Kirkland. It's just not clear that we can build our way out of this problem. That is, without doing something so extreme as to destroy the underlying quality and character of our wonderful city.</p> <p>I agree that housing costs in Kirkland are extremely high. I'd ask the city council to consider the idea that some areas are just expensive. Kirkland is one of those (and for good reason! It's an awesome place!). I would love to have a loft apartment in Manhattan that overlooks central park. I can't afford that, so I don't live there.</p>
11/28/2022	Housing Availability	<p>Regulate vacant homes (e.g., criteria around what is an acceptable time period for vacancy (e.g., &lt; 6 months), possibly ban foreign investment for a given period of time, increase tax levels for foreign investment, etc). Not only does this exacerbate the current issues around lack of affordable housing, it also impacts the safety of our neighborhoods, and negatively impacts community building and connection.</p>
3/28/2024	Housing Regulations	<p>Support housing policies H-1.D - modify development and environmental regulations; H-1.E - Permitting speed and predictability; H-1.J - Increased housing density near transit; H-1.S - Interjurisdictional consistency in regulating housing; and, H-2.H - Density minimums and flexible development standards to increase site capacity.</p>
7/17/2024	Housing Supply	<p>Build more housing</p>
6/27/2024	Housing Supply	<p>Support for increase in housing density near transit and reducing minimum parking requirements.</p>
3/6/2024	Housing Supply	<p>Increase housing to lower housing costs and meet housing demand.</p>
2/20/2024	Housing Supply	<p>Support of increasing housing supply and density to improve capacity, address basic human needs, economic growth, and environmentally sustainable.</p>
5/22/2024	Housing/Land Use	<p>Supports housing along transit corridors, eliminating parkign minumums, fixing middle housing regulations, building apartments, supports accessory commercial units (ACUs), cornerstores, and cafes in residential zones.</p>
6/26/2024	Housing/Land Use changes	<p>Support increasing housing density along transit corridors to greater than 100 dwelling units per acre</p>
	Housing/Land Use changes	<p>Apartment buildings in what were previously single-family zones is one way to do achieve our goals. Allowing ADUs, etc, is clearly not meeting the need - it is a lot to ask a home owner to undergo a big construction project and then become a landlord - this has been allowed in Kirkland for a while and seen very little uptake. Depending on the current zoning allowances is not going to meet the need, even if the "capacity" is there. Drastic change needs to be boldly sought.</p>
5/22/2024	Housing/Land Use/Transportation	<p>Does not support building more housing in areas with roads that do not support growth.</p>
5/22/2024	Housing/SCE	<p>Does not support additional housing development do to negative ecological impacts.</p>
10/31/2023	Land Use - Minimum Lot Size	<p>I encourage the City to investigate the economics of how smaller minimum lot sizes could incentivize the types of development that the City wants to encourage.</p>
6/6/2023	Land Use - Mixed Use	<p>City should have a policy that promotes facilities that are multi-use (e.g., affordable or supportive housing + services + something else like a day care)</p>
5/21/2024	Land Use Changes	<p>Does not support Par Mac CAR. Won't meet needs of average residents. Supports moderate density with abundant affordable housing, with retail supporting local residents.</p>



## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/19/2024	Land Use Changes	Supports Micheal's and Goodwill CAR land use changes
5/1/2024	Land Use Changes	Support land use changes to allow for denser uses, affordable housing in general citywide in order to have a less car dependant community, to be safer, greener, resilient tax base.
4/30/2024	Land Use Changes	Support change in land use along transit corridors to increase residential capacity and density to greater than 50 dwelling units per acre
4/30/2024	Land Use Changes	Support greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre; enable transit oriented development; increase apartments; support commercial uses in residential neighborhoods
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Support proposed land use changes; allow greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Support proposed land use changes; allow greater density than 50 dwelling units per acre
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes including along transit corridors; focus growth in Totem Lake with improved vehicle access
4/29/2024	Land Use Changes	Opposed to proposed land use changes including along transit corridors
5/23/2024	Land Use/Housing	Support building more housing; simplify zoning districts
5/23/2024	Land Use/Housing	Does not support Par Mac CAR. Too many units, would negatively affect the neighborhood and neighboring homes - views, traffic, infrastructure, privacy, and construction impacts.
5/23/2024	Land Use/Housing	Supports reducing or removing parking minimums; accessory commercial units (ACUs) on residential lots; reducing complex zoning and project reviews.
5/22/2024	Land Use/Housing	Does not support 50 unit/acre capacity study, especially along Market street/98th/100th. Supports policies for commercial businesses, but not high density mixed use. Supports streamlining development regulations.
9/23/2024	Middle Housing	<p>Quality middle and affordable housing is the backbone of any community (unless you're only looking for Kirkland to turn into a rich bedroom community like Medina with no stores or downtown).</p> <p>Livable, vibrant communities have housing for teachers, waiters, postal workers, pub hosts, baristas, home improvement contractors, fire personnel, secretaries, grocery clerks, doctors, yoga instructors, small business owners, and more. A mix of housing options for all the community members is vital.</p> <p>I am a Kirkland resident (and vote in every election) living in a large apartment complex on Central Way, I spend 50% of my income on rent for a one bedroom apartment. I'd look forward to continuing to live and work in Kirkland.</p> <p>I urge you to include ADUs, 4-plex units, and small apartment complexes along transit corridors and nestled within neighborhoods. And along the main thoroughfares, of course additional bigger apartment complexes. More supply of housing is needed in order to accommodate a growing population, to keep housing rental prices from ballooning, and to keep the vital cross section of community members Kirkland already has.</p> <p>Change is inevitable in a town. Please stand up to interest groups who are advocating for keeping the status quo. That's not how communities thrive.</p>
5/2/2024	Middle Housing/Density	Explicitly support the most sustainable and covert missing middle type, the single-stair plex-style apartment or condo, city wide. Create pre-approved 4-plex, 6-plex, 8-plex, and 10-plex programs like the existing DADU program.
4/26/2024	Middle Housing/Density	Encourage City Council and Planning Commission to direct staff to support housing policies-implementation of greater than 50 dwelling units per acre along the
1/18/2024	Middle Housing/Density	Opposed to middle housing construction of 3-6 units impacts in low density neighborhoods
1/17/2024	Middle Housing/Density	Supports increased housing density in single family neighborhoods
1/10/2024	Middle Housing/Density	Supports expanding housing options and increased density at a min. density of 6 unit buildings along frequent transit routes. Could expand from 1/4-1/2 walkshed.
6/13/2023	Middle Housing/Density	The City should take a step back and talk to community members to see what parts of missing middle housing are working and what aren't. She thinks missing middle could better align with the character of her neighborhood.
6/29/2023	Misc	Half if not 3/4 of your City officers and ELECTED city officials are corrupted, and some as far as partaking in human trafficking. Last thing people need is the government's "help" whether it be local or federal

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
	Parking Minimums	<p>Building an ADU would require setting aside 2 parking spaces (~400 sqft). A fourplex of 1 bedroom units would require 7 parking spaces (1000+ sqft). A small, 1000sqft restaurant would need to provide 10 parking spaces (1500+ sqft). It simply does not make sense to build reasonably affordable, multi-unit housing with such high parking requirements!</p> <p>Reducing parking minimums would allow developers to provide parking based on the actual demand and preferences of their customers, rather than on arbitrary and excessive standards. This would free up land and resources for more productive and beneficial uses, such as housing, retail, office, green space, and community amenities. Reducing parking minimums would also encourage more people to choose alternative modes of transportation, which would reduce our environmental impact, improve our public health, and enhance our livability.</p> <p>Thank you for your time, Oliver Chen</p> <p>Below is a link to an article that goes into more detail. More resources can be found online. <a href="https://www.planning.org/planning/2022/spring/a-business-case-for-dropping-parking-minimums/">https://www.planning.org/planning/2022/spring/a-business-case-for-dropping-parking-minimums/</a></p>
10/10/2024	Permanent Supportive Housing	<p>You do NOT have to look far to see the destruction of Seattle, the increase in CRIME and DRUGS. Why do you want this for Kirkland? Do you want businesses to leave Kirkland, as they have in Seattle? Kirkland needs to do their part, BUT DO NOT encourage the homeless to come to Kirkland by adding excessive "emergency housing".</p> <p>Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3)</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>o "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth."</li> <li>o Kirkland's number should be based on its emergency shelter needs, not on the fact that it is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth.</li> <li>o Homeless should be given shelter in their community.</li> </ul> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>▪ Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to.</li> </ul> <p>The community of Kirkland does NOT want excessive emergency housing. IT IS OUT OF scale. Please make reasonable recommendations to address the issue.</p>
10/10/2024	Permanent Supportive Housing	<p>Increasing density in the City must be done with careful thought about long term effects. Kirkland is already the 3rd most dense city in Washington. Placement of multi-unit housing in the wrong place will have unintended consequences that cannot be corrected. I have enclosed a copy of my August 19 letter which still applies. I am not sure who decided the allocation of the Kirkland housing needs from 2019 to 2044, but the parameters for these decisions should be questioned. The 2,546 for homeless is a huge number for a city this size. Placing homeless people in Kirkland, puts them distance wise far from any service for them. These people need more than shelter, but food, medical, etc. And I cannot see Kirkland spending the 200 to 300 million dollars to build these units, and millions to provide full-time administration, maintenance, and security. As stated previously in my earlier letter, until Seattle makes a commitment to solving homelessness by building and operating housing structures, Kirkland cannot solve the problem. Finally, a decision to open all single-family residential zoning to multi-family will mean the demise of the single family home, no matter the size. Small affordable homes that could be purchased for a first-time starter home will be bought by developers who can pay more and make a huge profit. Please continue with the present zoning and land use. Thank you.</p>
10/10/2024	Permanent Supportive Housing	<p>Dear Planning Commissioner Rozmyn, You do NOT have to look far to see the destruction of Seattle, the increase in CRIME and DRUGS. Why do you want this for Kirkland? Do you want businesses to leave Kirkland, as they have in Seattle? Kirkland needs to do their part, BUT DO NOT encourage the homeless to come to Kirkland by adding excessive "emergency housing". Oh, wait, maybe this is to benefit the developers? Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3) "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth." Kirkland's number should be based on its emergency shelter needs, not on the fact that it is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth. Homeless should be given shelter in their community. Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to. The community of Kirkland does NOT want excessive emergency housing. IT IS OUT OF scale. Please make reasonable recommendations to address the issue.</p> <p>Dear Planning Commissioner Rozmyn, You do NOT have to look far to see the destruction of Seattle, the increase in CRIME and DRUGS. Why do you want this for Kirkland? Do you want businesses to leave Kirkland, as they have in Seattle? Kirkland needs to do their part, BUT DO NOT encourage the homeless to come to Kirkland by adding excessive "emergency housing". Oh, wait, maybe this is to benefit the developers? Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3) "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth." Kirkland's number should be based on its emergency shelter needs, not on the fact that it is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth. Homeless should be given shelter in their community. Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to. The community of Kirkland does NOT want excessive emergency housing. IT IS OUT OF scale. Please make reasonable recommendations to address the issue.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	Permanent Supportive Housing	<p>I am writing to express my concerns regarding the proposed permanent supportive housing project inside Kirkland neighborhoods. While I understand the importance of providing housing solutions for those in need, I believe it is crucial to thoroughly study to find the most suitable locations for such developments. For many middle-class families, our home equity represents the most significant portion of our retirement savings. Any negative impact on property values could have serious financial implications for residents who have invested their life savings into their homes.</p> <p>Although some studies suggest lower impacts on property values, the other ones show higher impacts. It is evident that impacts on suburban settings like Kirkland are a lot higher than studies done in the Urban area of NYC. Given these uncertainties, I urge the city to use a more conservative approach like Bellevue and Redmond and focus PSH developments in urban villages and mixed use areas. Any PSH project in the neighborhood should be contingent to favorable results from the following studies:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Input from local residents and stakeholders to understand community concerns and perspectives.</li> <li>2. A thorough economic study of property value trends in suburban neighborhoods with existing supportive housing projects.</li> <li>3. A review of any changes in neighborhood safety and quality of life.</li> </ol> <p>By conducting this study, we can ensure that any decisions made are informed and considerate of the long-term well-being of our community. These decisions have a high level of impact on the residents and I urge you to follow best practices and avoid experimenting with things that are not backed by scientific studies. I appreciate your attention to this matter and look forward to your response.</p>
10/10/2024	Policy Edits	<p>Thank you for the important work that you are doing and for the continued opportunity to comment on this chapter of Kirkland's 2044 Comprehensive Plan particularly given the significant proposed amendments since the last hearing. I wholeheartedly support all of Vice Chair Heiser's proposed amendments as listed in Attachment 4 of the meeting packet. Her edits are sensible and on point. "To create healthy, equitable, vibrant communities well-served by infrastructure and services Kirkland will direct much of its housing growth into its designated urban centers, neighborhood commercial centers, and near neighborhoods where existing and planned transportation and infrastructure has been identified in the Transportation Element, Capital Facilities Element, and Utilities Element and related functional plans that support mixed use and 10-minute neighborhoods and where the goals, policies, and plans enable smart growth principles." As the Commissioners discussed with staff during the Land Use Element hearing, there is no clear definition of "10-minute neighborhoods" and it has different meanings for different people. Unless and until there is a clear consensus for and a definition set forth, none of the policies or goals in the Comprehensive Plan should include reference to "10-minute neighborhoods." Including it makes the Plan vague and does not put the community on notice as to what is intended or planned. For example, "potential 10-minute neighborhoods" should be deleted from revised Policy H-1.12. I support Policy H-2.XX which staff added in response to public feedback. "Policy H-2.XX - Promote fiscal sustainability, transparency, and accountability to existing taxpayers when subsidizing affordable housing programs and incentives." Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3) "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth." Kirkland's number should be based on Kirkland's emergency shelter needs, not based on the fact that Kirkland is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth. Homeless should be given shelter in their community. Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to. Policy H-2.2 - Staff's recommendation to change from "high capacity" to "frequent" is not well taken. In my opinion, it should actually say "reliable frequent high capacity transit infrastructure" to ensure that the transit service is actually serviceable and useful. Policy H-2.XX proposed by Chair Rutherford— I do not support this new proposed policy, especially increasing the number of attached dwelling units, presumably on the same property, though that is vague and another reason the policy does not make sense. (Stick with current law, e.g., HB1110) I am also concerned about potential safety hazards in only having a single stair for multi-floor multifamily residences. "Policy H-2.XX – Advocate for amendments to the Washington State Building Code to support the creation of housing that is more physically and financially accessible, such as regulations to promote universal design, streamline elevator installation, allow for more attached dwellings with residential code construction, and simplify building requirements in ways that maintain health and safety standards (such as allowing point access blocks up to six floors)." Goal H-2 – Update to reflect Kirkland, not some generic city. Modify the 1st paragraph of explanatory text: Current text: "Extremely low-, very low-, and low-income residents often have limited choices when seeking an affordable home and neighborhood. Many BIPOC communities and immigrant groups face disparities in access to opportunity areas with high quality schools, jobs, transit and access to parks, open space, and clean air, water, and soil." This is NOT talking about Kirkland. We have high-quality public schools throughout the city. We have clean air, water, and soil. And so forth. Please clear up vague and confusing phrases. For example: Policy H-1.1 – "Prioritize context sensitive regulatory and programmatic reforms to urgently bridge gaps in the city's housing land capacity for households at or below 50% AMI." Kind of a word salad. Does that really mean: Change zoning to enable construction of deeply affordable housing throughout the city? Policy H-1.5 – "Adopt development and environmental regulations that reduce the cost of building and stimulate the production of diverse</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
10/10/2024	Policy Edits	<p>The growth in Kirkland has gotten seriously out of control and is rapidly ruining the city's charm and character that so many of us moved here initially to enjoy. I'm a Kirkland resident of over 4 decades, raised my children here, run a small business here and have served my city in various commissions, boards and volunteer positions. I am disappointed in the leadership that has come to be, that has not shown a willingness to listen to the community. Please understand, I am not opposed to growth – I am for considered growth and in keeping with the city's character. Kirkland used to be a wonderful boutique community with more of a village, friendly appeal. With the current zoning, allowable building heights, and density plans – are ruining this rapidly. The Slater Mixed Use construction with nearly 500 residential units is an insult to the North Rose Hill Neighborhood, which is already absorbing more than its share of density housing. All without any sensible traffic impacts. You are the elected officials that this community has chosen to make considered decisions that will affect this city, for decades to come - and far past your terms. I implore you to envision decades down the line as to the impacts of your decisions. Furthermore, Neighborhood Associations have in the past, not been that useful as grassroots feedback from the citizens to the city, for various reasons. You NOW have a body of constituents with Cherish Kirkland with incredible backgrounds, expertise and profound dedication to this city. Tapping into this organization and incorporating members in various key advisory positions within the city's infrastructure would be to everyone's benefit. Please do this. Below are some specific comments on the Housing Chapter; echoing Liz Hunt's work on this as well as Vice Chair Heiser. I support all of Vice Chair Heiser's proposed amendments as listed in Attachment 4 of the meeting packet. Her edits are sensible and on point. I support Policy H-2.XX which staff added in response to public feedback. Policy H-2.XX - Promote fiscal sustainability, transparency, and accountability to existing taxpayers when subsidizing affordable housing programs and incentives." Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3) "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth." Kirkland's number should be based on its emergency shelter needs, not on the fact that it is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth. Homeless should be given shelter in their community. Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to. Policy H-2.XX – I do not support this new proposed policy, especially increasing the number of attached dwelling units (stick with current law, e.g., HB1110) "Policy H-2.XX – Advocate for amendments to the Washington State Building Code to support the creation of housing that is more physically and financially accessible, such as regulations to promote universal design, streamline elevator installation, allow for more attached dwellings with residential code construction, and simplify building requirements in ways that maintain health and safety standards (such as allowing point access blocks up to six floors)." Goal H-2 – Update to reflect Kirkland, not some generic city. Modify the 1st paragraph of explanatory text: Current text: "Extremely low-, very low-, and low-income residents often have limited choices when seeking an affordable home and neighborhood. Many BIPOC communities and immigrant groups face disparities in access to opportunity areas with high quality schools, jobs, transit and access to parks, open space, and clean air, water, and soil." This is NOT talking about Kirkland. We have high-quality public schools throughout the city. We have clean air, water, and soil. And so forth.</p>
10/9/2024	Policy Edits	<p>Thank you for the opportunity to comment on this very important chapter of Kirkland's 2044 Comprehensive Plan. I support all of Vice Chair Heiser's proposed amendments as listed in Attachment 4 of the meeting packet. Her edits are sensible and on point. I support Policy H-2.XX which staff added in response to public feedback. "Policy H-2.XX - Promote fiscal sustainability, transparency, and accountability to existing taxpayers when subsidizing affordable housing programs and incentives." Kirkland's target of adding 2,522 units of emergency housing is way out of scale for Kirkland. (page 3) "Emergency housing needs were determined by dividing the total countywide emergency housing needs by the city's percent share of planning countywide housing growth." Kirkland's number should be based on Kirkland's emergency shelter needs, not based on the fact that Kirkland is taking on a large amount of the countywide housing growth. Homeless should be given shelter in their community. Don't displace homeless people to Kirkland, forcing them to leave the community they know and are connected to. Policy H-2.XX – I do not support this new proposed policy, especially increasing the number of attached dwelling units (stick with current law, e.g., HB1110) "Policy H-2.XX – Advocate for amendments to the Washington State Building Code to support the creation of housing that is more physically and financially accessible, such as regulations to promote universal design, streamline elevator installation, allow for more attached dwellings with residential code construction, and simplify building requirements in ways that maintain health and safety standards (such as allowing point access blocks up to six floors)." Goal H-2 – Update to reflect Kirkland, not some generic city. Modify the 1st paragraph of explanatory text: Current text: "Extremely low-, very low-, and low-income residents often have limited choices when seeking an affordable home and neighborhood. Many BIPOC communities and immigrant groups face disparities in access to opportunity areas with high quality schools, jobs, transit and access to parks, open space, and clean air, water, and soil." This is NOT talking about Kirkland. We have high-quality public schools throughout the city. We have clean air, water, and soil. And so forth. Please clear up vague and confusing phrases. For example: Policy H-1.1 – "Prioritize context sensitive regulatory and programmatic reforms to urgently bridge gaps in the city's housing land capacity for households at or below 50% AMI." Kind of a word salad. Does that really mean: Change zoning to enable construction of deeply affordable housing throughout the city? Policy H-1.5 – "Adopt development and environmental regulations that reduce the cost of building and stimulate the production of diverse types of housing, in ways that maintain health, safety and environmental standards, both for market rate and affordable housing. Isn't this contradictory? Doesn't building housing for health, safety, and environmental standards potentially add to cost vs. reduce cost? Policy H-1.10 – "Develop a context-sensitive program that allows housing intensity bonuses for faith-based, or other non-profit and community-based organizations ..." What does context-sensitive mean? Why is there no mention of the wonderful features of Kirkland's housing? Our housing and neighborhoods are great assets for Kirkland! It is sad that there is very little mention of this in our Comprehensive Plan. Yes, we absolutely need to work on affordability, but we should also celebrate our diversity of existing housing and our fabulous and unique neighborhoods.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/26/2024	Policy Edits	Below Goal H-1 - Delete this from the first sentence: "prioritizing housing for households making 30% or less of AMI" This phrase conflicts with Policy H-1.1. Change "Require affordable housing or other..." to "Require necessary and appropriate affordable housing needed to meet current Community needs, or other..." Delete "and inclusionary requirements". Delete these policies entirely (H-1.6 - H-1.13, H-1.17, H-1.19-H-1.20). H-1.15-Change "Collaborate with developers to create" to "Encourage the creation of".
9/26/2024	Policy Edits	Policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 2500 feet of public or private daycares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities. Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters. Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members. We should create a new policy to support a variety of regulatory and programmatic solutions to incentivize ADU and DADU long-term rental units on the same parcel as owner-occupied primary residences.
9/26/2024	Policy Edits	Policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 1000 feet of public or private day cares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities. Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters. Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members. We should create a new policy to support a variety of regulatory and programmatic solutions to incentivize ADU and DADU long-term rental units on the same parcel as owner-occupied primary residences.

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	Policy Edits	<p>I have lived in Kirkland for 23 years, own two properties here and have had a great time raising my 3 children. I am writing to express my concerns regarding some of the policies proposed in the Draft Housing Element. I understand and appreciate the need to address housing affordability and homelessness, but it is crucial to balance these goals with the interests and well-being of existing residents in our residential neighborhoods.</p> <p>Another one of my primary concerns is the potential impact of increased housing density on the character and safety of our neighborhoods. Many of us chose to live in these areas due to the sense of community, safety, and access to essential services such as available capacity in neighborhood schools, adequate parking, water pressure, and fire and police services. I believe that any changes to housing policies should prioritize maintaining these qualities and not unduly burden current taxpayers (particularly those on fixed incomes) with the cost of incentivizing new affordable housing units. Policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element has not addressed the concerns of residents and parents/staff of children attending school in Kirkland regarding the placement of transitional housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing, and similar facilities in close proximity to schools, and parks, particularly when not accompanied by background checks and limitations on active use of illegal substances. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 1000 feet of public or private day cares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the proposed policy to promote redevelopment of public lands in residential neighborhoods to accommodate smaller manufactured homes. This policy is overly vague about how the city would get reimbursed for the development of this land and what the definition is of "smaller manufactured homes". Is the city becoming a public housing entity? Is this a "tiny home" with no connection to city water or sewage or fire sprinklers? Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element is not consistent with the vote taken by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2024 to remove Policy LU-2.4 (Transit Corridors) from the draft Land Use Element. Although the revised draft removes the word "corridors", references in Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4.</p> <p>I support the City's goal of expanding housing and neighborhood choice for all residents. However, a few policies were written in a way that deprioritized the voice and needs of some residents. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members.</p> <p>Finally, I recommend an additional policy to incentivize property owners to rent out their existing ADUs and DADUs. Today, many homeowners are reluctant to rent these units as there are too few protections to bear the financial risks due to costly property damage and/or non-payment during lengthy eviction periods. Instead, these units go underutilized and are not contributing to our missing middle housing supply. We should create a new policy to support a variety of</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	Policy Edits	<p>I am a long-time Kirkland resident, and I am writing to express my concerns regarding some of the policies proposed in the Draft Housing Element. I urge the city to prioritize existing city residents' interest and well-being and create a balance approach to provide affordable housing and transitional housing.</p> <p>When my family were house shopping, we decided to live in Kirkland for its small town feel and beautiful parks compared to Redmond and Bellevue. Policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element has not addressed the concerns of residents and parents/staff of children attending school in Kirkland regarding the placement of transitional housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing, and similar facilities in close proximity to schools, and parks, particularly when not accompanied by background checks and limitations on active use of illegal substances. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 1000 feet of public or private day cares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the proposed policy to promote redevelopment of public lands in residential neighborhoods to accommodate smaller manufactured homes. This policy is overly vague about how the city would get reimbursed for the development of this land and what the definition is of "smaller manufactured homes". Is the city becoming a public housing entity? Is this a "tiny home" with no connection to city water or sewage or fire sprinklers? Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element is not consistent with the vote taken by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2024 to remove Policy LU-2.4 (Transit Corridors) from the draft Land Use Element. Although the revised draft removes the word "corridors", references in Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4.</p> <p>I support the City's goal of expanding housing and neighborhood choice for all residents. However, a few policies were written in a way that deprioritized the voice and needs of some residents. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members.</p> <p>Finally, I recommend an additional policy to incentivize property owners to rent out their existing ADUs and DADUs. Today, many homeowners are reluctant to rent these units as there are too few protections to bear the financial risks due to costly property damage and/or non-payment during lengthy eviction periods. Instead, these units go underutilized and are not contributing to our missing middle housing supply. We should create a new policy to support a variety of regulatory and programmatic solutions to incentivize ADU and DADU long-term rental units on the same parcel as owner-occupied primary residences.</p> <p>By incorporating these changes (please see specific wording in Appendix below), I believe we can achieve a more balanced approach that addresses the urgent need for affordable housing and homelessness prevention while also respecting the interests and concerns of existing residents. It is essential that we work together to create a community that is inclusive, safe, and reflective of the values that make our neighborhoods special.</p>

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	Policy Edits	<p>I am deeply concerned by proposed changes included in the current draft of the Housing Element and their impact, through increased housing density, on the character and ultimate safety of our neighborhoods. In particular, policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element has not addressed the concerns of residents and parents/staff of children attending school in Kirkland regarding the placement of transitional housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing, and similar facilities in close proximity to schools, and parks, particularly when not accompanied by background checks and limitations on active use of illegal substances. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 1000 feet of public or private day cares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities.</p> <p>I am also concerned about the proposed policy to promote redevelopment of public lands in residential neighborhoods to accommodate smaller manufactured homes. This policy is overly vague about how the city would get reimbursed for the development of this land and what the definition is of "smaller manufactured homes". Is the city becoming a public housing entity? Is this a "tiny home" with no connection to city water or sewage or fire sprinklers? Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters.</p> <p>The draft Housing Element is not consistent with the vote taken by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2024 to remove Policy LU-2.4 (Transit Corridors) from the draft Land Use Element. Although the revised draft removes the word "corridors", references in Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4.</p> <p>I support the City's goal of expanding housing and neighborhood choice for all residents. However, a few policies were written in a way that deprioritized the voice and needs of some residents. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members.</p> <p>Finally, I recommend an additional policy to incentivize property owners to rent out their existing ADUs and DADUs. Today, many homeowners are reluctant to rent these units as there are too few protections to bear the financial risks due to costly property damage and/or non-payment during lengthy eviction periods. Instead, these units go underutilized and are not contributing to our missing middle housing supply. We should create a new policy to support a variety of regulatory and programmatic solutions to incentivize ADU and DADU long-term rental units on the same parcel as owner-occupied primary residences.</p> <p>By incorporating appropriately worded changes, I believe we can achieve a more balanced approach that addresses the urgent need for affordable housing and homelessness prevention while also respecting the interests and concerns of Kirkland's existing residents. It is essential that we work together to create a community that is inclusive, safe, and reflective of the values that make our neighborhoods special.</p> <p>I urge you to urgently consider appropriate wording and amendments that will accommodate these changes before the revised Housing Element moves forward.</p>



## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
9/24/2024	Policy Edits	<p>I live in Kirkland and I am writing to express my concerns regarding some of the policies proposed in the Draft Housing Element. I understand and appreciate the need to address housing affordability and homelessness, but it is crucial to balance these goals with the interests and well-being of existing residents in our residential neighborhoods. One of my primary concerns is the potential impact of increased housing density on the character and safety of our neighborhoods. Many of us chose to live in these areas due to the sense of community, safety, and access to essential services such as available capacity in neighborhood schools, adequate parking, water pressure, and fire and police services. I believe that any changes to housing policies should prioritize maintaining these qualities and not unduly burden current taxpayers (particularly those on fixed incomes) with the cost of incentivizing new affordable housing units. Policies H-1.1, H-1.2, H-1.4, and H-1.10 should be amended to include protections to maintain neighborhood character of residential areas while allowing for the ongoing support of middle housing construction. Policies H-1.7 and H-1.9 should be amended to remove references to developer incentives that can only practically be financed through increasing taxes paid by existing property owners. The draft Housing Element has not addressed the concerns of residents and parents/staff of children attending school in Kirkland regarding the placement of transitional housing, emergency shelters, permanent supportive housing, and similar facilities in close proximity to schools, and parks, particularly when not accompanied by background checks and limitations on active use of illegal substances. Policies H-1.8 and H-1.9 should be amended to ensure that such facilities are not sited within 1000 feet of public or private day cares, schools, or public parks and residents do not have violent histories or active use of illegal substances, and prioritizes placement of Kirkland residents in these facilities. I am also concerned about the proposed policy to promote redevelopment of public lands in residential neighborhoods to accommodate smaller manufactured homes. This policy is overly vague about how the city would get reimbursed for the development of this land and what the definition is of "smaller manufactured homes". Is the city becoming a public housing entity? Is this a "tiny home" with no connection to city water or sewage or fire sprinklers? Policy H-2.10 should be removed as it is inconsistent with providing safe and clean residential neighborhoods and moves the city into a business model not supported by the voters. The draft Housing Element is not consistent with the vote taken by the Planning Commission on September 12, 2024 to remove Policy LU-2.4 (Transit Corridors) from the draft Land Use Element. Although the revised draft removes the word "corridors", references in Policies H-1.13 and H-1.14 to direct much of housing growth should be limited to "designated urban centers and commercial centers" and remove references to "and near transit" to be consistent with intention of removing Policy LU-2.4. I support the City's goal of expanding housing and neighborhood choice for all residents. However, a few policies were written in a way that deprioritizes the voice and needs of some residents. Policies H-2.6 and H-2.9 should be amended to include the needs of disabled persons and people with medical conditions and Policy H-2.19 should be amended to include the voice of all community members. Finally, I recommend an additional policy to incentivize property owners to rent out their existing ADUs and DADUs. Today, many homeowners are reluctant to rent these units as there are too few protections to bear the financial risks due to costly property damage and/or non-payment during lengthy eviction periods. Instead, these units go underutilized and are not contributing to our missing middle housing supply. We should create a new policy to support a variety of regulatory and programmatic solutions to incentivize ADU and DADU long-term rental units on the same parcel as owner-occupied primary residences.</p>
3/22/2024	Senior housing	I've lived on the Eastside my whole life and now that I'm a senior, what is your plan to not price us out of our homes?
12/11/2023	Senior housing	What can Kirkland do to help keep existing residents in Kirkland house? Only thing I'm aware of is a King County Senior Property Tax exemption and that's County. What is Kirkland doing? Can you quantify it?
8/23/2023	Senior housing	As a self-supportive retired, senior housing that is affordable is crucial. We must be able to live in a safe and clean community. Kirkland is in dire need of affordable housing.
7/12/2023	Senior housing	The aging community is seldom discussed. Many long-time residents have paid the bills (taxes) and contributed their time to bring Kirkland to the wonderful place it currently is. But many are becoming property-rich (because of appreciation) but income-poor (because of escalating property taxes and low fixed monthly
10/17/2022	Senior housing	Separate building codes for senior housing-larger doors, halls, bathrooms, no barriers to showers or parking
10/8/2024	Transit Corridors	I am a voting resident of Kirkland. I do not want transit corridors. Metro and Sound Transit determine the transit routes, not the city of Kirkland. Therefore the increased growth areas should be where Metro and Sound Transit are focusing their transit development (I-405), not in areas west of I-405 where land is expensive and there is not the infrastructure to support large developments. I am fully supportive of low income housing, but I would like to know how the city plans to fund it?
	Transit Oriented Development	Allow mid-rise, 6 story, mixed use within 1/4 mile along transit corridors and 4 story, mixed use within 1/2 of mile of every bus stop served by frequent transit line; plan ahead for transit opportunities

## Housing Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
10/10/2024	Transportation and Housing	<p>I am resending the message below to Planning Commission due to failure of my first attempt. Errata: it's NE 124th Street in Totem Lake that is always congested. I am writing to express my concern on the lack of robust analyses of the required infrastructure services, especially transportation, to support our ambitious housing targets. The draft Transportation Strategic Plan does not clearly lay out how we will ensure adequate capacity for serving all the new housing that the city aspires to accommodate in the next 20 years. If Metro and Sound Transit are not willing to provide bus services with 10 to 15 minute headways for 18 hours a day to our neighborhoods, we should renegotiate our housing targets and only agree to provide a number that is based on our current transit services. We cannot accommodate a significant increase in single-occupancy vehicle trips anymore as our arterial streets are already congested. I live in the 98034 zip code and do my main shopping in Totem Lake. I noticed how Slater Lane and 124th Avenue NE are always congested during rush hour and that's at the current predominantly low-density conditions comprising of light industrial uses and strip shopping centers. The Comprehensive Plan assumes that having a designated transit corridor, specifically, the development of the bus rapid transit on I-405, is adequate to support the increased density in Totem Lake (and Downtown Kirkland). Was there a study to show that replacing these existing commercial uses in Totem Lake with high-density mixed-use projects will result in less congestion? As someone who has lived in Chicago without owning a car, I can assure you that it takes more than an El line to make a walkable, transit-oriented city. Chicago has a robust transit system of buses and trains that served every neighborhood, where no resident has to walk more than 15 minutes to get to a bus stop and catch a bus or train every 15 minutes (or less during rush hour). The kind of 10-minute neighborhoods you are talking about can only be successful with a robust mass transit system. As one resident noted at a public hearing, it is unrealistic to expect that residents who live in the 10-minute neighborhood will only work and shop in that neighborhood. The 10-minute neighborhood is not the panacea for our anemic transit services. The Housing Element of the Comprehensive Plan should include an alternative scenario of housing targets with current transportation system capacity that carries mostly single-occupancy vehicle trips or else our Comprehensive Plan will fail. Thank you for your consideration.</p>

## Human Services Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Topics:
11/7/2023	Affordable Housing	The Eastside emergency shelters are full, which means camping bans cannot be enforced on public property. if the eastside is interested in clearing encampments, it needs 1) more shelter space and 2) more supportive housing to open up beds at existing shelters
10/31/2023	Affordable Housing	The Eastside desperately needs more affordable housing, as our shelters are currently full and without anywhere for people to go, existing camping bans cannot even be legally enforced, leading to difficult community relations
6/15/2023	Affordable Housing	<p>I've been living in my vehicle for 11 years. I've heard people refer to Van life, etc, as houseless as opposed to homeless. I think fundamental need is more along the line of food and warmth. As a houseless person, sometimes we don't have warmth, because we don't have access to any electricity. A person could do well with a very small living space, not necessarily a house, as long as we have food and warmth. I know that sounds minimalistic, but honestly, I know a lot of people who moved into housing after living in their vehicle, and they were also very cold because they couldn't afford to turn the heat on. I've known people who were in housing who had to seclude themselves to one room in the house or apartment in order to stay warm.</p> <p>Add to that, they didn't have money for food because their income went all to rent. Currently that's my situation. I very recently, (after 8 1/2 years of living in a parking lot,) received assistance to pay first and last month's rent on a spot; \$600. After the two months is up, every penny I have is going toward that rental spot, and I will have no money for food, gas, medications, doctor appointments, toiletries, etc.</p> <p>The insanity of this is, when I had a voucher, they would cover up to \$1,800 with me only having to pay \$450 a month. Because my trailer is on wheels, they won't even help me with \$600 much less the difference. So come I very likely will wind up back in my van on the street after 2 months, because I need food, medications, gas money. Asking humans to change is a big request. I can't think of what could be asked of people in the area of change. But I do know that people will be more receptive to changing if they know what they might receive as a benefit in return. There might be something that has to be offered as a benefit, otherwise it feels more like corralling someone to do something against their will and or better good.</p> <p>If nothing tangible can be offered, then perhaps at least some policies could be put in place to protect against either real or misperceived threats, disadvantages, or even losses.</p>
6/6/2023	Affordable Housing	Participant has unique disability/health issues that make her very sensitive to all chemicals (chemically injured- cannot be exposed to chemicals, such as those in new buildings and those in most laundry detergent) and she has been impacted by living in a place with mold. It makes living in an apartment building impossible and there are very few options for affordable housing that are single occupancy and that would accept Section 8 voucher. Andrea had an experience of using a Section 8 voucher for housing but it didn't work out, and then she wasn't able to use the voucher elsewhere. Need to be able to keep a voucher if housing does not work out. City should raise awareness about the danger of mold in buildings. Many developers spray with chemicals so mold doesn't grow but that is an issue for her... developers should bring in a dehumidifier before finalizing the building.
6/6/2023	Affordable Housing - mixed use	City should have a policy that promotes facilities that are multi-use (e.g., affordable or supportive housing + services + something else)
6/6/2023	Affordable Housing - mixed use	There should be more collaborative efforts by the City for facilities that combine multiple services or uses (i.e., housing + services or day care). There should be funding to incentivize this. Housing/affordable housing should be paired with grocery stores and services that assist low-income people like tax prep services.
12/11/2023	Affordable housing - seniors	What can Kirkland do to help keep existing residents in Kirkland house? Only thing I'm aware of is a King County Senior Property Tax exemption and that's County. What is Kirkland doing? Can you quantify it?
6/15/2023	Communication/Outreach	<p>Question #2: Besides the internet, there are several methods the City can use to improve information sharing:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Mailings: Sending out physical mailings can reach residents who may not have internet access or prefer offline communication.</li> <li>b) Radio: Utilizing local radio stations can help disseminate information to a broader audience, particularly those who listen to the radio regularly.</li> <li>c) Newspapers: Placing advertisements or publishing articles in local newspapers can reach people who rely on traditional print media for news.</li> <li>d) Posting on bulletin boards: Sharing information on community bulletin boards in public spaces, such as libraries, community centers, and local businesses, can help increase visibility.</li> <li>e) Open house sessions: Organizing open house sessions or community meetings where residents can directly engage with city officials and ask questions can foster better communication and information sharing.</li> <li>f) Translating materials and providing interpretation: Ensuring information is available in multiple languages and providing interpretation services during meetings and events can help reach a more diverse population and improve accessibility.</li> </ul>
6/6/2023	Communication/Outreach	The City relies on the internet for dissemination of information. But people may not know what they're looking for or need, or where to find the information on the website. This is especially hard for people who speak english as a second language.

## Human Services Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Topics:
6/6/2023	Cultural center	It would be great to have a cultural center here. Bellevue has one or is creating one.
6/6/2023	Equity - BIPOC	High earners are in the seats of power in the City. Council/decision-makers are white homeowners. Trust is a challenge for black residents because of unequal policing and lack of representation.
6/6/2023	Equity - renters	Renters are not well-represented at City Council and commission meetings.
6/6/2023	Equity - renters	Renters' rights - renters are at the mercy of landlords. They may have poor living conditions but they cannot move because of lack of affordable options.
6/6/2023	Equity - renters	More support for low-income renters is needed so they can continue to live in Kirkland.
6/6/2023	Equity - renters	Some landlords blatantly discriminate against those who have Section 8 vouchers (some landlords say they won't rent to them, which is illegal). Can the City enforce equal treatment?
6/6/2023	Equity - seniors	There is discrimination in hiring of older adults (ageism).
6/14/2024	General	The Human Services Commission provided a letter with detailed proposed revisions for the Human Services Element goals and policies.
5/14/2024	General	<p>Question #5: To meet basic needs, which types of services or uses should be paired with affordable housing or permanent supportive housing? (For example, behavioral &amp; mental health services, day cares, grocery stores, community space) All of the above, but it's all EXPENSIVE. Development of housing should heavily factor the cost of the land in the first place as a means to maximize the number of housing units and still allow for all these additional services/amenities.</p> <p>Question #6: What kinds of job training/skill training/access to higher education would be useful? On one hand, tech jobs are in high demand these days so coding education and such is important. On the other hand, physical trades are still necessary and we need people entering the workforce there, too (plumbers, electricians, etc.). All of the above.</p>
5/14/2024	General	<p>Q2: Besides using the internet, how can the City do a better job of reaching people to share information? (For example, mailings, radio, newspapers, posting on bulletin boards, having open house sessions, translating materials and having interpretation available) Honestly, I don't know. Maybe we could ask the help of groups associated with the targeted (marginalized) communities: the Iman center posts notices in the mosque; the senior center sends out emails; etc.</p> <p>Q3: How can the City better reach renters? How can the City get more renters engaged in civic processes? Target/via the community college and buses.</p> <p>Q4: Which areas (locations) are most impacted by transportation concerns? Which types of services do people have difficulty accessing due to inadequate public transportation? What are your ideas to address transportation concerns? The areas with the least bus access are most impacted. Buses are a catch-22, I realize. Routes don't work without riders, but riders won't move into areas without routes. This encourages economically-segregated neighborhoods.</p> <p>Q5: To meet basic needs, which types of services or uses should be paired with affordable housing or permanent supportive housing? (For example, behavioral &amp; mental health services, day cares, grocery stores, community space) As someone who has supervised clinical staff in PSH and worked within public housing, I can speak to this directly. First, healthcare services. This includes primary care and behavioral healthcare. Both are very important. Case management services are vital, as well. Food banks are very important to such residents, as well.</p> <p>Q6: What kinds of job training/skill training/access to higher education would be useful? I teach at the local community college: LWTech. We have affordable adult education: bachelors degrees, associate degrees, certificates, ELL, high school completion, basic adult education... Few folks know about us, however. We do good work. We have good results. And we're ready to bring people in.</p> <p>Q7: How can the City support services like public restrooms and showers? Make them &amp; clean them often! Yes, we need public facilities!</p>
7/15/2024	Homelessness	Homelessness needs to be addressed at EVERY level, not to have any level (federal, state, county, city, neighborhood, or individual) insist that they can act without regard to the impact and insist it is some other level's problem. It is everyone's problem, as we all have seen with our children as they grow to adulthood unable to afford to live in our neighborhood, and our neighborhood not having the variety of housing options that would work for everyone. Apartment living can actually be much more appropriate as we age, as newer construction includes elevators and ADA amenities, and we don't have to struggle with lawn care, and this would allow more of the large homes to come on the market for larger families.
6/13/2023	Programs - grants	City should consider giving low-income folks flexible direct cash grants. People know what they need.
6/13/2023	Programs - job training	The City should partner with community organizations/non-profits to spread the word about job training/skills training programs that exist
5/22/2024	Seniors	Here is the definition to be submitted to the Kirkland 2044 Comp Plan. Aging in place is more than just safety and accessibility at home. It is also critical that a community comes together to support aging populations and ensure that seniors can remain active and integrated in the society around them as they grow older.
5/23/2024	Seniors	Support aging populations and ensure that seniors can remain active and integrated in the community.
8/23/2023	Services	More options for community care and physical exercise.
7/28/2023	Services - behavioral	Question about behavioral service requests that can remain anonymous (Neighbor seems to have mental illness impacting neighborhood.)
6/6/2023	Services - facilities/low income	Participant has been living in her vehicle for the past 10 years. Challenges: facilities to take a shower and do laundry that are suitable for chemically-injured people (where others do not use chemicals in detergent, for cleaning the facility, etc.)
6/6/2023	Services - facilities/low income	Provide amenities to homeless people/those living in their vehicles.

## Human Services Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Topics:
7/28/2023	Services - transit/medical	More Bus Stops, More access to sexual health resources, Free Clinic
6/6/2023	Transit - access to services/low income	Transportation is an issue on the Eastside. Getting to food bank can be hard, people may not be able to afford gas. Shelters are located in areas with bus routes but then King County Metro cuts routes. There used to be a bus route to access Hopelink in Kirkland but it was cut. Can the city provide public transportation, especially to access services?
	Various	<p>To better reach renters and increase their engagement in civic processes, the City can consider the following:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Outreach programs: Implement targeted outreach programs specifically designed to engage renters, such as hosting meetings in areas with a high concentration of rental properties.</li> <li>b) Online platforms: Utilize online platforms, such as social media and dedicated websites, to share information and provide opportunities for renters to participate in discussions and provide feedback.</li> <li>c) Partnerships with property owners/managers: Collaborate with property owners/managers to disseminate information to tenants and encourage their participation in civic processes.</li> <li>d) Tenant associations and community organizations: Support and collaborate with tenant associations and community organizations that focus on renters' rights and participation in local decision-making processes.</li> </ul> <p>Question #4: To identify the areas most impacted by transportation concerns and address service accessibility, the City can:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Conduct surveys and gather feedback: Conduct surveys or public consultations to gather information on transportation concerns from residents in different neighborhoods. This can help identify areas where transportation services are inadequate and the specific services people have difficulty accessing.</li> <li>b) Analyze data: Analyze transportation data, such as ridership statistics, traffic patterns, and existing infrastructure, to identify areas with the greatest need for improvement.</li> <li>c) Infrastructure development: Invest in improving transportation infrastructure, including public transit routes, bike lanes, and pedestrian-friendly pathways, in areas that are identified as having transportation concerns.</li> <li>d) Collaborate with transportation agencies: Work closely with transportation agencies, such as public transit authorities or regional planning bodies, to advocate for improved services and address transportation challenges.</li> </ul>
	Various	<p>To meet basic needs in conjunction with affordable housing or permanent supportive housing, the City can consider the following services or uses:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) Behavioral and mental health services: Provide on-site or nearby access to mental health professionals and resources to support the well-being of residents.</li> <li>b) Daycare facilities: Establish or partner with daycare centers to offer affordable childcare services for families residing in affordable or supportive housing.</li> <li>c) Grocery stores: Ensure easy access to affordable and healthy food options by encouraging the development of grocery stores or supporting mobile food markets in the vicinity.</li> <li>d) Community spaces: Create communal areas or community centers within housing developments to foster social connections and provide spaces for educational, recreational, and cultural activities.</li> </ul>
4/24/2024	Youth	Ron Abram, Director, and Laura Blackett, Interim Senior Director, of Homeless Youth Services - Shelter and Drop In Services will present on the opening, impact, future plans, and needs of Willows Youth Service Center - An emergency shelter and services for young adults ages 18-24.
3/19/2024	Youth	Youth are facing difficult stress and need meeting places with activities and counseling.
6/6/2023	Youth	There are not many places for teens/young people to hang out without it being considered loitering/without needing to spend money.
6/6/2023	Youth	There should be a teen crisis clinic as a safe space for youth.

## Parks, Recreation & Open Space Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
3/14/2023	Accessibility - CKC	CKC does not have any wheelchair accessible access in its southern third. The hills that cross the trail are quite steep. The parking lot at 108th St could have an accessible parking space/area so that people can access the CKC. Overall, more comprehensive ADA access to parks/trails is needed.
3/14/2023	Accessibility - Parks	Parks Department needs to be mindful of accessibility issues when there is construction next to parks. For a while, people in wheelchairs could not access Kirkland Urban from Peter Kirk Park because of construction. This has come up in PFEC – they discussed parking garages at parks, but parking garages are difficult for seniors because they are dark and the short sightline. Public sidewalks have lots of root problems which is hard for people with mobility issues. The City is not addressing this. Concerned that trees are being cut down because of issues with overhead power lines.
7/28/2023	Biking	I wish we have more bike land!
7/28/2023	Biking	I wish there was more bike trails
7/28/2023	CKC	Love the Cross Kirkland Corridor
7/28/2023	Community	I love Kirkland because all of the parks are super fun and new!
10/1/2023	Dog parks	Increase dog parks on Lakes
7/28/2023	Dog parks	Would like more Dog Parks!
7/28/2023	Dog parks	Offleash dog park with Water access
7/28/2023	Dog parks/sidewalks	Dog park, or pop up ones in popular parks, As population increases new sidewalks in new areas
8/19/2024	General	One reason Kirkland is incredible is because of the work the city did decades ago (think all the money, resources, and effort required to ensure we have miles of lake-front parks!).
2/6/2024	General	I strongly support the new sections concerning urban parks and new uses of parks which are proposed for the Parks, Recreation and Open Space Element. We need a variety of public, open spaces that are distributed throughout the city, including areas where we are focusing development. Adding more uses to parks, such as vendor stands or other small businesses, will make our parks more attractive and vibrant, encouraging more use and fostering community. It's also a great way to encourage more walking and biking.
5/1/2023	Green spaces	Policy LU-6.1: Distribute parks and open spaces throughout the City, with particular focus on new facilities in areas of the City facing the greatest population growth, in areas where facilities are deficient, and/or in areas where connections of the open space network could be made.
7/28/2023	Green spaces	More attention by Kirkland to 'wild areas' on 94th ave
3/14/2023	Green spaces	Commenter lives on 3rd St before the green belt. She encourages the City to pay attention to wildlife and preserve natural areas for wildlife. During the past Comp Plan where she participated as part of Planning Commission, the City was supposed to keep the area by Forbes Creek as a green belt but now it's being sold off and developed. She encourages the City to change the zoning or take other action to preserve the area. Perhaps strengthen policies around green belts and wildlife corridors. She likes the tree rebate program and would like to see Arbor Day celebrations happen again. Parks are very important to her and her family. Her grandchildren use Crestwoods Park a lot.
7/28/2023	Land use	Floating Structure as sanctuary or retreat space for the community (e.g. yoga, dancing, Sup lessons)
2/8/2024	Land use/Trees	My name is Forrest Whitehouse and I'm a resident of Moss Bay. In anticipation of tomorrow's study session on the parks and sustainability elements of the comprehensive plan, I want to share a few points of feedback for your consideration: 1. I'd like to see the city explore having more businesses in its parks. Chainline Station in Ferriton Spur Park is a beloved third place that has brought a lot of liveliness to that area. We could imagine similar breweries, cafes, and the like in our parks or along the CKC. There are cafes in many major city parks elsewhere, and they are always a welcome sight for thirsty or hungry parkgoers. It would be great if the parks element could call this out more specifically. 2. I'd like to find opportunities to increase our tree canopy by un-paving and replanting underutilized individual parking spots and shoulders on neighborhood streets. This could be done at a very small, very local scale, and in direct partnership with nearby residents. It would beautify and shade the street, mitigate the heat island effect, add to our tree canopy, and even help with traffic calming. I hope we will be open to both large- and small-scale transformations to help rebuild our tree cover. 5. Two things that rock and that I'm glad to see are already covered in the parks element: (1) I love trails that go through parks rather than simply to parks. We should keep viewing parks as connective elements for the city. (Mentioned in PR-4.1.) (2) I don't have a dog, but I love off-leash dog areas so much. The highlight of my morning is riding past the Snyder's Corner dog park and seeing all the happy pups and humans playing. I hope we continue to build more like it. (Mentioned in PR-5.6.)
7/28/2023	Landscape	More Plants

## Parks, Recreation & Open Space Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/28/2024	Natural Environment	The City's Comp Plan will benefit from the perspective of the Snoqualmie Tribe Ancestral Lands Movement (STALM), which focuses on responsible recreation centered in mindfulness for the natural world. The City of Kirkland is part of the Tribe's ancestral lands, and the Tribe has stewarded these lands since time immemorial. Humans are not separate from the natural environment; we are a part of it. We show this understanding through respect for our surroundings; both for those who came before us and those who come after us. Some ways the City should embrace the teachings of the STALM and incorporate the values of the Snoqualmie Tribe in to the plan: Always consult with sovereign tribes in a meaningful way when developing recreation that impacts their ancestral lands within the City. Invest in updating existing interpretive signage that includes Native erasure and always work with tribes in the development of new interpretive signage to make sure Native erasure does not occur. Ensure residents are informed about the impacts of certain behaviors associated with recreation may have on our ancestral lands (stay on trails, do not contribute to illegal trails, report illegal trails, pick up your trash and other trash you find, keep your dogs on leashes and pick up their poop to name a few). Develop trails in clusters rather than dispersed whenever possible to minimize impacts on wildlife and cultural resources. Invest in decommissioning illegal trails that impact cultural resources and wildlife. Always work with tribes to make sure they have access to critical areas for harvesting and gathering. Use native plants whenever possible and embrace sustainable measures while limiting maintenance activities that contribute to air and noise pollution and disturb humans and wildlife.
5/23/2024	Parks - General	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife submitted a comment letter that included a table with several specific comments and recommendations about the Parks Element.
7/28/2023	Public safety - lifeguards	Lifeguards at Denny- Collaborate w/ King County, Lifevests are great addition thanks
8/5/2023	Recreation - marina	The boat station needs to be fixed updated. Upon getting out the trip hazards from the uneven boards are to the point over the last five years that when we get out of our boat, I have tripped sprung an ankle before long you're gonna have someone really hurting themselves. They're his mothers fathers, children's grandparents, aunts and uncles. There's lawyers doctors teachers people that need their jobs and if they get hurt, they can't do it and everything breaks down injuries are going to happen physical injuries. You guys are the only ones who can take and redo that marina. It's an embarrassment when people come from other countries and other cities to use a marina to see the shape that it's in Kirkland has a lot of money there's no reason why this cannot be put on a proprietary list , the reason I'm writing this letter is because yesterday a pregnant woman was coming out of her boat with her husband and she tripped and fell. That's not good assistant to the community of boaters who pay money to park . Its bad it looks horrible but most of all it's highly dangerous. Trying to walk on that pier the slivers are so bad so so bad another thing that is of concern last year we had our boat there because there was no bumpers along the edges. We incurred \$3500 worth of damage because of that pier not being in good shape, the boating that we do, we do it as a necessity to keep our family ties strong to keep our kids away from drugs and alcohol to be able to socialize and have a good time and enjoy our beautiful lake Washington. We enjoy bringing my families here, who are from Syria from Italy from Spain in the boating. The marina has been used by my family for generations, we're creating strong family ties because of this activity we can't do it without a proper marina I'm afraid this wonderful tradition that so many families have instituted in their family will be long gone. please consider properly redoing that marina in Kirkland. and this would contribute to the enrichment of strong family ties strong family ties contribute to a strong community.
7/28/2023	Recreation - pickle ball	More pickleball courts
7/28/2023	Recreation - Pool	Indoor Aquatic Center
10/1/2023	Recreation - sports fields	Increase multi-sports fields
10/1/2023	Recreation - sports fields	Expand sports field lights til 11pm
7/28/2023	Recreation - volleyball	More vollyball nets!
11/3/2023	Safety	Better and safer parks for children with more activities
7/30/2023	Services - feet washing	Consider adding feet washing facilities at parks. This is a cultural norm for Muslims. He has seen people washing their feet in sinks and it creates a mess.
7/28/2023	Services - public restrooms	Maintain opening of public restrooms during winter.
7/28/2023	Services - trash	I love Kirkland's new walking bridge by Totem Lake. I would add more trash cans outside walkway.
7/31/2023	Shade/Shelters/Trees	Suggests more weather-sheltered pedestrian areas and park spaces given our wet climate.
7/28/2023	Shade/Shelters/Trees	Love the parks, but would like more shade at them. Thank you!
5/8/2024	Sustainability-Connectivity	Focus on sustainability in parks (not only preserving our existing parks, but expanding them), connectivity, and empowering our parks and waterfront
7/28/2023	Trails	Have more trails
7/28/2023	Trails	Trails
7/28/2023	Trails	Have more trails
7/28/2023	Waterfront - boats	Better boat launch
7/28/2023	Wildlife	I wish fish had a place to have for fish to lay eggs

## Sustainability, Climate & Environment Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
3/2/2023	Climate	The climate is constantly changing, throwing tax dollars at a non-issue is a waste of money. Don't fall into the scam. One more thing why does the city of Kirkland need a 1 billion operating budget?
4/12/2024	Climate - policy	PSE submitted an excel spreadsheet with model policy language to address climate change
5/28/2024	Climate, Indigenous Knowledge	Snoqualmie Tribe SCE comments: We would like to comment the City of Kirkland on proactively committing to work with local Tribes to protect the environment and for making a serious commitment to reducing greenhouse gases. This section of the comprehensive plan was well thought out and included specific partnerships and programs that will help to make the City's efforts successful. We appreciate how the themes of this section are reflected in other sections of the plan, including the Land Use element and the Parks, Recreation, and Open Space element. As the City looks to continue to bring its critical areas regulations into better agreement with Best Available Science (BAS) ( <a href="https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01988">https://wdfw.wa.gov/publications/01988</a> ), it needs to do so with an eye toward achieving the best outcomes for the environment under the present day circumstances where so much of the City is already built out, frequently in ways that could be nonconforming when those regulations are updated. In future updates, please include Indigenous Knowledge and Science on, at minimum, equal footing with Western Science. The Biden-Harris Administration has formally recognized Indigenous Knowledge, also referred to as IK or TEK, as one of many important bodies of knowledge that contributes to the scientific, social, and economic advancement of communities in the United States. The federal government has provided related guidance for federal agencies for many years. As stated in the 2022 Guidance, "It reaffirms that Agencies should recognize and, as appropriate, apply Indigenous Knowledge in decision making, research, and policies across the Federal Government. This guidance is founded on the understanding that multiple lines of evidence or ways of knowing can lead to better-informed decision making." We request that the City create policy to similarly recognize and incorporate IK in its future decision
5/22/2024	Climate/Environment	<p>I often wonder why no one ever questions the ecological factors of all this overdevelopment. There are already developments that the city has snuck into nooks and crannies that were green and most likely had trees (cleaning and cooling our air). Adding thousands of people (and double the number of cars) is a HUGE contributor to global warming. All the concrete structures hold and retain heat that is emitted into the environment. All these people will need water and lots of it. The quality of our current tap water will decline since it is not sustainable to support. All these people will need electricity. All these people will need heat/air conditioning.</p> <p>All these people will be sitting in their cars clogging up the roads. So much for a Green Environment in Washington State. Kirkland, Redmond, Bothell, Woodinville. All of these were sustainable, nice communities. Suburban not Urban. Can you explain how you perceive the ecological impact? Can you tell me how you support this?</p>
3/15/2023	Density	<p>Your massive and inappropriate densities have resulted in ugly development that has pretty much destroyed downtown and most of the surrounding area.</p> <p>I guess since so few who work at the city are actually from here it's no big deal for you to just destroy Kirkland.</p>
2/6/2024	Embodied carbon	<p>I also support the majority of the changes to the Sustainability, Climate and Environment Element, particularly those regarding water quality, restoring water features to natural conditions, reducing VMT, and promoting clean fuels/electrification. However, I would like to express strong concerns about the change to Policy E-4.6. Adding the clause for embodied carbon is unnecessarily limiting. The existing text for this policy doesn't preclude embodied carbon limits—I certainly think an embodied carbon limit counts as an "innovation in local codes". Embodied carbon limits are an interesting concept and they should be explored, without committing right now to set one for all projects. I worry that embodied carbon limits could become a hinderance to projects that we know are necessary for Kirkland, such as housing and transportation improvements. My understanding is that this is a pretty new approach in climate policy, and it's unclear how to weigh the embodied carbon of a project against the potential a project has to reduce on-going carbon emissions. Personally, I think the City should prioritize incentives for projects that reduce embodied carbon. For example, there are many new concrete formulations with much lower (or even net-negative) embodied carbon, which are currently more expensive than traditional concrete. If the city provides incentives, more projects will be able to use these innovative materials which support our sustainability goals.</p> <p>Finally, I think that policy E-2.1 has confusing wording. It implies that maintaining the canopy will "increase public outreach", "dedicate resources for monitoring" and "establish strategic partnerships". I think it's more accurate to say that taking these actions will improve Kirkland's tree canopy, rather than these actions being caused by improving the tree canopy. We should absolutely do and encourage these things; I just think the wording is a bit backwards.</p>



## Sustainability, Climate & Environment Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
6/21/2024	Environment/plants/trees	The Duwamish Tribe submitted comments - see comment letter for more details. [staff summary] The Duwamish Tribe recommends that woody debris be used where it makes sense in urban streams to slow down waterflow. We recommend that natural drainage systems like swales be used when reconstructing or redesigning public works like sewer or stormwater systems. We recommend native plantings in and around waterways and streams to encourage native habitat and slow down runoff in urban areas during significant rain events. We encourage homeowners and developers to plant native vegetation for the same reasons and to encourage native pollinators. It would also be beneficial to have native plants easily accessible and available for everyone along with planting guides. The Duwamish and other tribes see food as medicine. Lack of access to our traditional foods leads to an increased rate of decline in our physical and mental health. The Duwamish Tribe would like the opportunity to work with the City on such a project. We recommend that water in and around the city be monitored continuously for water quality and particularly after storm events. We recommend the ban of harmful or toxic chemical fertilizers and insecticides to further increase water quality for fish, wildlife, native birds, pollinators, and humans. For aesthetics and light pollution, the Tribe requests that the City provide responsible outdoor lighting as outlined in DarkSky International - protecting the night skies for present and future generations. They night sky was important to the Duwamish and other tribes and allowed us to understand and verify our seasonal calendars. We also recommend that mature native trees in and around development projects are evaluated culturally. Mature trees can be of profound cultural significance to the Duwamish and other tribes and provide innumerable benefits. If a tree is suspected to be culturally modified, the tribe would like to be notified and would like the opportunity to come to the site to ensure its protection.
5/23/2024	General	See letter from Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife for comments on multiple topics related to the Sustainability, Climate, and Environment Element.
3/14/2023	Greenspaces	She lives on 3rd St before the green belt. She encourages the City to pay attention to wildlife and preserve natural areas for wildlife. During the past Comp Plan where she participated as part of Planning Commission, the City was supposed to keep the area by Forbes Creek as a green belt but now it's being sold off and developed. She encourages the City to change the zoning or take other action to preserve the area. Perhaps strengthen policies around green belts and wildlife corridors. She likes the tree rebate program and would like to see Arbor Day celebrations happen again. On her street, there are no sidewalks, curbs, or gutters but the runoff water is diverted to a rain garden. However, without sidewalks, curbs, and gutters, there is limited accessibility.
3/14/2023	Heat pumps	She has all gas appliances. She watched the heat pump seminar but is worried about not being able to use appliances if the power goes out (concern about utility redundancy). Seniors are concerned about heat. So it doesn't make sense for her. However, after hearing from David Barnes that heat pumps filter the air (including smoke), installing a heat pump could make sense, as long as the electricity stays on.
3/2/2023	Parks	What a joke! Kirkland had beautiful natural park (132nd Square) w/ lawns & trees Now, 2 years of construction, Trees & Lawn & Natural areas are gone... Yet, they send off a citizen survey about "helping the environment" for 2044 How about stop destroying PARKS in 2022??
7/31/2023	Solar	Could those that have shaded properties utilize energy from solar panels elsewhere?
5/8/2024	Sustainability-Connectivity	Focus on sustainability in parks (not only preserving our existing parks, but expanding them), connectivity, and empowering our parks and waterfront
5/23/2024	Trees	My husband and I have lived in Kirkland for over 50 years. Five years ago we moved from the West of Market area because on retired teachers salaries we could not afford the property taxes. We now live on Finn Hill in a less expensive home but are alarmed at some of the choices the City of Kirkland has made in recent years. While individual homeowners are incredibly restricted in cutting down any trees (including dead ones in danger of falling on our houses) the city allows developers to clear cut property they want to develop. While trees are replaced they will never replace the old growth trees lost. A major part of the charm of Kirkland is no high rises. Now there are two proposals for large apartment buildings at the two intersections we need to go through to get off Finn Hill. The proposal for a 7 story apartment building at the Goodwill Site across from Juanita Elementary will cause incredible traffic congestion at an already seriously overcrowded intersection not to mention the huge impact it will have on the enrollment at Juanita Elementary. The other 7 story proposed project at the current Michael's location will cause more gridlock at another choke point in Kirkland. Please consider the impact you are forcing on your current citizens in order to make room for others to move here!

## Sustainability, Climate & Environment Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
5/8/2024	Trees	<p>"Preserve and enhance the tree canopy and other open spaces to reduce carbon emissions"</p> <p>This is in your proposal. and not being done city wide.</p> <p>Evergreens are being cut down all over Moss Bay where I have lived fir 25 years. Google, Urban, 85th street interchange expnsionc, condos with replacement with small spindly deciduous trees. (Also along Juanita Drive recently).</p> <p>And no additional evergreens are being planted anywhere with plans to cut down 2 acres of evergreens on Lee Johnson site if Google ever proceeds with development of three 20 story office towers.</p> <p>Evergreen Trees are vitall to reduce carbon emissions and heat pockets.</p> <p>Kirkland City Council revised Tree policy to allow all of this. They are listening to developers and not environmentalists.</p> <p>This needs to change if we the City want to seriously deal with the climate change issues.</p> <p>Please see article below. This is happening in our city as we speak. It is so counter to reducing effects of climate change.</p> <p><a href="https://www.nytimes.com/2024/04/22/opinion/trees-cities-earth-day.html?smid=url-share">https://www.nytimes.com/2024/04/22/opinion/trees-cities-earth-day.html?smid=url-share</a></p>
9/19/2024	Trees-Climate	<p>We love Kirkland because it has been environmentally conscious in ways we have not seen in other areas. We keep trees-- significant and smaller, as well as plant native plants, we try to walk when we can, reuse, recycle, compost, open windows instead of turning on AC, leave less of a carbon footprint. Until now. So, beyond the traffic and crowding impact, beyond the strain on our water supply, schools, garbage, sewer, electricity, health facilities, and food, building more and more high-rises impacts our environment in ways that will dramatically effect the future of the planet.</p> <p>~ Cutting down significant trees has a known impact on carbon increase. Each tree over a certain age reduces carbon in ways baby trees never could. Kirkland knows that. The world knows that. It's why the beautiful Kirkland has so many limits on tree removals...for individual residents. According to the planners at last night's meeting, trees are not important when they interfere with building high-rise complexes or parking lots. Is that monetarily motivated, residents wonder? WE want to be environmentally friendly. We love our state for the trees and waters, the mountains and streams.</p> <p>Residents wonder how the extra cars will effect the air quality, the carbon footprint. Global warming. They are right to wonder. It will effect it a lot. What no one is considering is the global impact of the AC in those thousands upon thousands of units. AC is in the new complex advertisements next to "sweeping views" and the rental price of \$2,000 for one bedroom, \$3,000 for two. The impact of AC on global warming is not a recent discovery, but its impact is starting to be known more and more, and it's huge: Here is what scientists are saying:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1.Cooling is a big contributor to global warming. Much of the existing cooling equipment uses hydrofluorocarbon refrigerants, which are potent greenhouse gases, and use a lot of energy, making them a double burden for climate change.</li> <li>2.The irony: the widespread use of ACs is actually driving up temperatures by feeding the climate crisis, which could leave up to three-quarters.</li> <li>3.By the end of the century, greenhouse gas emissions from air conditioning will account for as much as a 0.5-degree Celsius rise in global (more with multifamily dwelling increase).</li> </ol> <p>More heat means more fires, as well, which increase the global warming more. We tell South America to leave the trees, and then we, who may actually have a more significant role environmentally, and with global warming, chop them down for AC-filled high-rises.</p> <p>It's a big concern that I'm surprised Washington is not considering in this weird from- the-top building mandate we Washingtonians did not vote for. What poor care-taking of the beautiful lands I'm seeing. We care so much about this beautiful place. I hope you do, as well, and might do something about it. Thank you for listening</p>
8/22/2024	Trees and Trails	<p>I support the FHNA board comments on the latest version of the 2044 Comprehensive Plan Update, i.e. that stronger and more definite language be used for acquiring and permanently establishing green spaces, to keep pace with increased housing and retail building. The tree canopy should be at 40% or greater for livability and health, both of us humans and the environment. Maintaining the green character of the Kirkland neighborhoods and our Pacific Northwest forests are essential to our way of life and are what make living here unique. We have observed too many large trees being removed to make way for housing; these cannot be re-planted with equivalent-size trees. It will be many years before the small re-plants will be tall enough to create a canopy. We need a stronger requirement to save the large trees. Strong definite language that leaves no wiggle room for overdevelopment in areas too far from the public transit hubs is important. Kirkland needs to facilitate getting cars off the roads and people into our evolving public transit, and to do that housing and shopping need to be where the transit goes and is based. It's important to continue developing walking and biking trails that facilitate getting to mass transit without using a car and that are separated from heavy-traffic roads. The Cross-Kirkland Trail is a good example. It's vital to provide green-space car free foot and bike trails that connect neighborhoods and connect to mass transit. Does the 2044 Comprehensive Plan Update address building these trails as well as establishing parks and green spaces to keep pace with greater dwelling density?</p>

## Sustainability, Climate & Environment Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
3/14/2023	Trees - canopy	The tree canopy is vastly disappearing. It cleans the air and provides shade. Believes the tree code is very long, complicated, and that it seems like developers would be able to find a loophole to cut down the trees. Concerned because of air quality. She is also concerned about multifamily and high rise buildings that barely have any trees and do not have AC. Thinks developers should be required to install AC in new construction.
2/8/2024	Trees - canopy; material reuse; embodied carbon	<p>2. I'd like to find opportunities to increase our tree canopy by un-paving and replanting underutilized individual parking spots and shoulders on neighborhood streets. This could be done at a very small, very local scale, and in direct partnership with nearby residents. It would beautify and shade the street, mitigate the heat island effect, add to our tree canopy, and even help with traffic calming. I hope we will be open to both large- and small-scale transformations to help rebuild our tree cover.</p> <p>3. The new policy E-4.1 discusses a tool and building material reuse facility. This is a great idea and something I'd love to have access to in my neighborhood. However, I'd suggest a change in wording from "to develop a facility" to "to develop one or more facilities." Since we are pursuing 10-minute cities, it could be more beneficial to have a network of smaller-scale tool libraries rather than a single central facility. I'm sure the city will iterate on this idea, so I want the language to give us the flexibility to experiment.</p> <p>4. Policy E-4.6 has been revised to include the phrase "and establishing embodied carbon limits for all projects." I have mixed feelings about how vague this wording is. Although I want us to reduce embodied carbon across the board, there's no explanation of how such carbon limits would work. Would there be a single, universal, procrustean limit that would privilege single-family homes and punish large multi-family buildings? Would the limit prohibit projects that have a large up-front embodied carbon but a negative lifetime carbon footprint, like some mass transit projects have? I don't want a limit that will harm our sustainability goals. I believe more clarity is needed in the language we're using. If at all possible, we should take into account (1) the lifetime carbon footprint of each project</p>
9/28/2023	Trees - canopy; transit; streets; walkability	Kirkland is growing too quickly. The green canopy has dropped well below the 40% target, and programs to provide trees are sparkly diversions rather than solutions. The street capacity is not sufficient, the support of public transit and alternate transit is not sufficient. Even walking to school is challenging with unsafe walk ways.
7/31/2023	Trees - development	Does tree protection increase development project costs which in turn gets placed on future renters/homeowners to absorb that cost?
3/14/2023	Trees - ROW	He is interested in information/guidelines/help (non-monetary) from the City regarding maintenance of trees in order to be more proactive and not reactive. There are many streets that have trees that have grown into the sidewalks or root issues that make it impossible for people in wheelchairs to pass.
3/15/2023	Trees - streams	Over by me they are putting in a traffic circle. We use to have a lovely creek and they put in a culvert and covered it up. They've destroyed at least 100 trees between me and 405. It's simply the most gorgeous community update I've ever seen (yea that's sarcasm).
4/11/2023	Utilities	Can we start with stopping sewage from entering Juanita Beach?

## Economic Development Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
10/1/2023	Affordable housing	increase affordable housing
5/8/2024	Draft Policies	<ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>•Strategy-I'd argue against specifically calling out Totem Lake and Downtown, as that leaves out a LOT of the city (Finn Hill, Juanita, Houghton, etc.).</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-1.2- Instead of 'targeted recruitment activities', I'd focus on removing the existing barriers that prevent people from becoming entrepreneurs, like restrictive zone and parking minimums.</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-1.6-Maybe add something here about regional transit, as being a destination won't work well if it's a pain to get to.</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-1.7-I'd be cautious with language like 'wherever appropriate', as NUMBYs love to claim that neighborhood cafes are 'inappropriate'. But I do see what you're going for (no one wants an auto body shop next door). Maybe add language that acknowledges there's room for nuance here.</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-1.8-Maybe instead of listing out all the different groups you're targeting, use more inclusive language like 'under-served' or 'under-privileged' or 'under-represented'. Maybe add something in here about supporting co-ops?</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-2.1, ED-2.3-These look bang on!</li> <li>•Revised Policy ED-2.4-Same as ED-1.8, could use more inclusive language, but I see what you're going for.</li> <li>•New Policy ED-5.6-Is this even necessary? Seems oddly specific and not really related to Kirkland. I suggest removal.</li> <li>•In general, maybe a bit too focused and specific on the DEI items. Could change the language to something like 'the needs and requirements of typically under-represented communities, like BIPOC, immigrant, etc.' I don't think it needs to be so silo'd.</li> </ul>
8/19/2024	General	<p>The city seems extremely focused on increasing economic diversity here, and I applaud that effort. However, by doing this, the city is reducing/eliminating its ability to make large, long term investments to make Kirkland an even better place to live. A recent example is the vote to build the aquatic center. The number of high-income folks in Kirkland who are willing and able to take on even larger tax burdens, is becoming a smaller and smaller portion of the Kirkland population. Likewise, the portion of the city that's "just getting by" is becoming a larger and larger portion of the population (and we're doing this on purpose, right?). Asking these folks to willingly increase their tax burden for big projects is absurd. Pressing this agenda means the city will no longer be able to get a majority of citizens to support these huge (expensive) projects.</p>
6/6/2023	Jobs	There should be opportunities for good jobs besides tech in Kirkland
7/26/2024	Land use	Opposed to Par Mac request due to business displacement and negative impacts on neighboring residential properties.
5/22/2024	Land use	<p>Many of the existing and proposed policies favor high density residential and office development with very little for retail or other commercial and industrial uses. It's not feasible to have an auto repair shop with multi story office or residential space on top. Kirkland has lost or lost out on businesses due to its unwelcoming policies towards businesses. If the city really wants to foster development of 10-15 minute communities where there are jobs and services in proximity to residences, it needs to have far more welcoming and supportive policies to those businesses.</p>
10/23/2023	Retail	<p>Key Themes Summary (see meeting notes for more detailed summary):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable or used clothes stores – especially for youth</li> <li>Less expensive retail stores; thrift stores, antique stores where students could work, sell things; Sustainable clothes options; not "fast fashion"</li> <li>Affordable places to hang out; meet friends; "Third Places"; only places now are libraries</li> <li>Hardware store</li> <li>Outdoor equipment store</li> <li>Used books stores</li> <li>KTUB would be a good place to have a retail store</li> </ul>
11/14/2023	Various	<p>Key Themes Summary (see separate meeting notes document for more detail):</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Affordable and Americans with Disability Act accessible Universal Design housing</li> <li>Sustainable development</li> <li>City provide a start a new business informational packet</li> <li>Sidewalk system that is connected, accessible, and safe</li> <li>Reliable transportation and transit system</li> <li>Business revitalization incentives; Façade improvements to older commercial strip malls as a temporary fix until they redevelop; provide a grant program as an incentive</li> <li>Reduce parking requirements for commercial uses</li> </ul>

## Economic Development Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
	Various	<p>Focus Group Key Themes Summary</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>-Provide space for entrepreneurs; small business start- ups to “test the market”</li> <li>-Need reliable, accessible transportation and transit system for employees to get to work and deliver goods and services</li> <li>-Variety of affordable housing options for workers to live and work in Kirkland</li> <li>-Provide year around farmers market or multi-cultural community space for non-profits or new businesses</li> <li>-Improve communication with businesses so they feel heard especially in the design and construction of city projects, street closures, and land use decisions that may impact businesses</li> <li>-Streamline permit review process and business license approval</li> <li>-Provide small business support for new businesses such as: how to create business plans; how to start a business; a place to “test” market products to readjust/re-invent; understanding their customers; small incubator spaces for new pop-up businesses</li> <li>-Downtown: Increase parking and pick up and delivery for customers to access businesses; Improve maintenance of alleys, remove weeds, garbage, add landscaping, screen garbage dumpsters, repair sidewalks and parking lots</li> </ul> <p>Individual Comments:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Provide space for entrepreneurs; small business start- ups to “test the market”</li> <li>Importance of reliable, accessible transportation and transit system; consider a shuttle service (like Bellevue’s Bell Hop shuttle)</li> <li>Provide a variety of housing options for affordable housing for workers to live and work in Kirkland</li> <li>Property owners need to keep costs of commercial tenant spaces lower to discourage losing businesses and non-profits to outside of community</li> <li>Keep light industrial zoned property for industrial types of businesses rather than displacement for residential uses</li> <li>Provide year around farmers market or multi-cultural for non-profits, community space</li> <li>Hybrid workplaces are here to stay and changes the dynamic of vacant office with retail</li> <li>Online retail uses are here to stay</li> </ul>
	Various	<p>City’s role:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>Improve communication with businesses so they feel heard; especially related to design and construction of city projects, street closures, and land use decisions that may impacts businesses</li> <li>Streamline permit review process and business license approval</li> <li>Provide small business support for new businesses; financial literacy with creating business plans; how to start a business; a place to “test” market products to readjust/re-invent; understanding their customers; small incubator spaces for new pop-up businesses; Note-See City’s new business support consultant</li> <li>Understand the disparity gap for small and minority businesses to gain more insights to match up to the right resources. Ranging from education, financially, promotion, collaboration that focus on affordability and success to diverse communities (Seattle has a program).</li> <li>Increase public services (fire, police) for crime prevention for businesses and public safety, including parking garages</li> <li>City’s role is not as a business incubator</li> <li>Provide affordable, accessible, transit or transportation options for employees to get to work</li> <li>Fast, reliable internet and electric infrastructure for businesses</li> <li>Provide areas for pick up and drop off for delivery services</li> <li>City’s strategy of replacing light industrial businesses with office, High Tech employees or housing uses is disappointing for some</li> <li>Invest in infrastructure improvements</li> </ul>
6/6/2023	Youth	There are not many places for teens/young people to hang out without it being considered loitering/without needing to spend money.

## Neighborhood Plans Public Comments\*

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment Summary
7/24/2024	85th Street Station Area Plan	<p>I support the proposed policies for the 85th Street Station Area. I particularly like the concept of subareas, which encourage and concentrate certain types of land uses based on the physical and historical context of the subarea. I agree with the need to break up the superblocks along the NE 8th Street Corridor to create more pedestrian-friendly mixed use and transit-oriented development. I also agree with the use of form-based code to allow for a variety of land uses without compromising the quality of the built environment. The following are additional items I hope you will consider:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- Consider pedestrian-bike connections to further break up large blocks. There may be limitations to requiring a road through a superblock but it should not preclude redevelopment of the site into a walkable and pedestrian-friendly community asset.</li> <li>- Add a composite multimodal transportation network and active uses map that illustrates what the station area will look like if policies related to a finer grained street network is to be implemented. Identify priority areas for active uses to better guide development. Not all streets can support active uses but we can encourage and require them where the development density are highest and where they are viable locations for businesses. Where it does not make sense to locate active uses, consider requiring live-work units and residential units with stoops and front doors along the street.</li> <li>- In the maker district, allow live-work spaces.</li> <li>- If any of the grocery store or anchor business sites are to be redeveloped, ensure that the grocery store use can be accommodated in the new development through a combination of incentives, flexibilities and zoning requirements.</li> <li>- Rose Hill gateway district – it is not clear what the intended character of this gateway district is. We have an opportunity to define the character of the corridor through the design of buildings, not just the landscaping and hardscape at the ground plane. Further study of the urban design for this gateway district should be conducted.</li> <li>- Create a hierarchy of public realm designs based on the type of street or transportation facility. For example, along NE 85th Street, a major arterial, require wider sidewalks with generous landscape and street trees to buffer pedestrians from the high volume and higher speed automobile traffic. Where the existing grade of the redevelopment site is significantly lower than NE 85th Street, require new development to build up to the sidewalk grade for the floor of the main building entries and active uses.</li> <li>- Accommodate food trucks and kiosks near the entrance of the BRT station. Ensure that the BRT station is surrounded by informal surveillance at all times by requiring active uses on ground floors of mixed use buildings across the station entrances.</li> <li>- Any new city capital facilities such as a fire station, community center, aquatic center, etc. should be leveraged by developing affordable housing above the community spaces on site.</li> <li>- Figure 13 – provide a north arrow or street names for orientation</li> </ul>
7/25/2024	Bridle Trails	[staff summary] Suggested corrections and changes to the Bridle Trails Neighborhood Plan - see cumulative comment document for full list.
6/25/2024	Bridle Trails	[staff summary] From The Board of SRH/BT list of responses to staff-recommended edits, reactions to edits, and comments about suggested additions to the Bridle Trail plan policies. See cumulative comment document for full list.
5/23/2024	Bridle Trails	The Vision Statement still refers to Houghton Park and Ride providing transit access; it no longer exists. Only 1 bus route stops near the former park and ride. Additionally, Policy BT 8 states that future Transit Oriented Development should be encouraged at the Houghton P&R site. However, this seems inconsistent with the city's desire to repurpose the site as either a pool and recreation center, or an ice hockey facility. I think more should be done to encourage more transit options and transit oriented development in the Bridle Trails neighborhood.
7/9/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	Concerned with a number of proposed changes to the Houghton Neighborhood Plan. I understand the need to project growth but it appears that many of the proposed changes are being done so without regard for neighborhood impacts as well as resident engagement. Examples: The term medium density has been replaced with higher density - what does this mean? Why is transportation and infrastructure being moved to a different portion of the plan? Does increased density lead to greater affordability? Would be nice to see examples of where this has occurred. References to Houghton's character have been replaced with words like density and intensity. What does this language mean? How will it impact Houghton? Regarding Northwest University, what does the proposed "thoughtful design" verbiage mean?
7/9/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	Houghton resident with comments on the Houghton Neighborhood Plan proposed edits - see compiled document for full list.
7/9/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	<p>So many of my neighbors are dismayed by the rampant growth in this neighborhood. Reasonable sized homes are torn down and mega homes are built in their place. The city must put in place measures that allow/require smaller single family homes to be built. The idea that an all or nothing approach to affordability and availability- as in having either multi-million dollar homes or small apartments- for families is not City Planning.</p> <p>Houghton is a wonderful place to live, one of the best benefits for those that can't afford the view homes is driving down 70th/68th and seeing the water and the mountains over the rooftops of the Houghton commercial area. The thought of 5-story buildings packing into the area is heartbreaking. The feel of this small neighborhood should be thoughtfully planned to allow for growth, 3-story mixed use buildings seem reasonable to allow for both growth and neighborhood appeal.</p>
7/8/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] From the Houghton Neighborhood Association: list of responses to staff-recommended edits, reactions to edits, and comments about suggested additions to the Central Houghton Neighborhood plan policies. See cumulative comment document for full list.

7/7/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	Phyllis A. Needy Houghton Neighborhood Park needs an urgent rehaul of the children's playground. Currently, no changes are planned but I want to bring attention to the state of the facility. To say the least, this park is depressing. The structure for the kids play area, is small and outdated. The sandbox is another underwhelming area. The swings are also very old.  A good example of a great kids play area is inspiration playground at downtown bellevue park which has a rubberized floor, a water play area, and updated play structures.
6/27/2024	Central Houghton Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] From The Board of the Houghton Neighborhood Association: list of responses to staff-recommended edits, reactions to edits, and comments about suggested additions to the Central Houghton Neighborhood plan policies. See cumulative comment document for full list.
7/25/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Comments from the Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance (FHNA) concerning proposed updates to the Finn Hill neighborhood plan.
7/24/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance: supplemental document USGS Land Classification Sheet March 1900 - UW maps_533_extralarge
7/24/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance: supplemental document Granddaughter of Reinikainen family -- DorisSnow - FinnFest UW 1999
7/24/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance appendix B: suggested errors within the existing historical context section of the Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan
7/24/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance appendix A: preferred text for the historical context section of the Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan
7/24/2024	Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan	As we (Finn Hill Neighborhood Alliance) reviewed the proposed changes to the Finn Hill Neighborhood Plan, I noticed a number of factual inaccuracies in Section 3, the "Historical Context" section (on p.326 of the July 25 packet; for some of its errors, see 'Appendix B', below and attached). We ask the Planning Commission to substitute the language found in 'Appendix A' (below and attached) in place of the current 'Section 3: Historical Context', within the Finn Hill
7/25/2024	General	The neighborhood plan updates are not reflective of Kirkland's neighborhood. What the proposed new plans seem to be calling for is such a hard push for housing density without regard to the impact it has on the surrounding communities. The engagement with the community has been negligible from the city. We need to slow this process down, really look at what each neighborhood is and can be. The minimal outreach and awareness that exists around these proposed changes is unacceptable given the level of change that is being proposed. Neighborhood plans should be shaped co-operatively with the community and the city. Not this top-heavy, special interest group, developer driven way.
7/24/2024	General	Concerns with recently added text about reducing costs to building housing and sustainability: 1. Lower costs of construction do not automatically translate into increased affordability. 2. Even if lowering costs of construction would be helpful, that is a tactic, and tactics should be generally reserved for the zoning code – e.g. density, setbacks, design regulations, ratios, etc. That approach would be consistent with your discussion at your most recent meeting where you consistently – and correctly – determined to keep the Comprehensive Plan less elaborate and more conceptual, and then will be addressed via KZC. 3. I applaud the addition of sustainability in each of the places that has been suggested, thank you. However, sustainability can also increase the costs of construction, depending on the circumstances, and so having a "cost decrease" direction in the same sentence as "sustainability" could be in direct conflict. 4. The mention of reduced costs is actually a risky thing to mention in the Comp Plan. It potentially allows the Comp Plan to provide a broader or more vague interpretation of building standards than the KZC does at that point in time, whether that relates to the costs of construction or the scope of the buildout - and then applicants and neighbors lawyer-up, which is not pleasant to say the least. And while I do recognize that there are minimum standards and codes that builders must adhere to, construction that just squeaks by is more likely to have issues requiring expensive repairs, even with all of our inspections, and those issues will disproportionately have negative impacts on those who can least afford to contend with them. Bottom line, I shudder to think that a less than thoughtful builder would have a Comp Plan to point to that encourages them to build cheaply. I know that cheap and shoddy housing is not at all what the author intended, so please know this is not at all a criticism of the intent.
7/24/2024	General	Consistent with the draft Comprehensive Plan Vision statement "Neighborhoods have diverse housing to accommodate residents in every stage of life.", each neighborhood should accommodate its proportionate share of affordable housing units.
7/11/2024	General	I'm broadly in favor of all the changes to neighborhood plans, and moving them into the comprehensive plan to ensure they are actually updated regularly. On a surface level, it looks like a lot has changed, but really it's mostly language and organizational changes. As you know, the comp plan is only the first step of change happening, and I don't think the neighborhood plans specifically call for much to change. However, I've seen a lot of concern among neighborhood associations (including my own) about the process change, and also concerns about a lot of the language updates. Again, I think the neighborhood plans really haven't changed much so I don't agree with them, but I think it's worth directly addressing some of their concerns so they feel like they aren't being cut out.

7/11/2024	General	<p>I am truly concerned; the lack of clear process and genuine community involvement in the development of these plans has been disheartening. Two commission meetings and a city council in a row the engagement with the actual comments from the community have been negligent at best. I don't think a board notice that is put up ***after*** the meeting deciding itself was held (as is the case for the Juanita plan for Michaels and Goodwill) is genuine outreach and engagement. The way this is playing out seems very much like the plan is set and nothing much will change. I am not even sure what help this comment will do but am sending it in to voice my concerns with this process. The staff doesn't even seem to actually know the neighborhoods. Housing diversity and housing security and housing affordability all go hand in hand and much of what I see proposed lately, particularly in one offs (i.e. the Goodwill site zoning exemption getting stuffed into a neighborhood plan), don't reflect any real interest in addressing housing thoughtfully. Let's just throw another luxury apartment building for tech bros up with no consideration of what would make sense long term to foster community - from the physical plans to the closed door feel of it all, I am not confident that Kirkland and its neighborhood's future are being built collaboratively.</p> <p>I would like to see the whole process slowed down, the neighborhoods actually engaged in a meaningful fashion. Otherwise this whole process is one that is disingenuous, driven by developers and special interest groups like Kirkland Strong.</p>
5/23/2024	General	<p>By trying to eliminate the character of our neighborhoods from any sort of consideration the city will make bad policies. I understand the rush to increase density at all costs are being done under the auspices of the housing emergency. However, in our rush to "solve" the housing crisis let's not harm the very people and city you as elected officials are meant to serve. I would therefore request that all the edits eliminating all mention of preserving the character of our neighborhoods be put back in place as they should continue our city planning into the future.</p>
5/22/2024	General	<p>Our neighborhoods facilitate a sense of community and engagement and help keep Kirkland alive and well. The City seems to think that having neighborhoods somehow prevents growth, additional density, 10-15 minute walk communities, and diversity and inclusion. This is not true at all. Neighborhoods can in fact be a great way to foster each of those. Instead of trying to eliminate and neutralize neighborhoods, the City should be working with the neighborhoods to develop plans and policies that foster the goals and needs of the City and its residents while maintaining the vibrant and connected neighborhoods.</p>
5/22/2024	General	<p>There are many critically important variations of land use throughout Kirkland that are reflected in today's neighborhood plans, associated terminology, and neighborhood-specific zoning codes. Neighborhood-specific land use maps and neighborhood-specific land use policies, definitions and specifications must be restored to the Comprehensive plan.</p>
	General	<p>Update neighborhood plans with major comprehensive plan updates; not annually</p>
6/26/2024	Highlands Neighborhood Plan	<p>This may be beyond the scope of the Comp Plan update but: 1) Does it make sense to remove the NE 90th St. non-vehicular bridge from the CIP, given the 85th connection that is being built? If we can't remove it from the CIP, can we at least remove it from the neighborhood plan? 2) We badly need two safety improvements at 112th Ave NE and NE 87th St: - extruded curbing at the south end of 112th (it was removed during a development and not replaced) to prevent cars parking there or swerving into path users. - a crosswalk on the north side of NE 87th St, across 112th Ave NE. We've submitted both of these to the NSP two years in a row and been told NSP can't consider them because they may be covered under Station Area Plan proposed improvements. However, extruded curbing would be a quick cheap fix. As for a crosswalk, do the SAP improvements address the north side of NE 87th or only the south side?</p>
7/7/2024	Land Use	<p>Opposed to density along transit corridors</p>
7/11/2024	Market Neighborhood	<p>I hope this message finds you well. My name is Mike Moghaddas, and I am a resident of 1117 1st Street, Kirkland. I am writing to express my strong opposition to the proposed changes to height limits and density in our neighborhood. Market Street is not just a thoroughfare but a community that I have called home for last 20 years. Its unique blend of small businesses, local charm, and pedestrian-friendly environment are what drew me to live here, and I am deeply concerned that altering these aspects could irreversibly impact our neighborhood's character and livability. Here are the specific reasons for my opposition:</p> <p>Preservation of Neighborhood Character: Increasing height limits risks altering the skyline and aesthetic appeal of Market Street. It is crucial to maintain the current scale that contributes to our neighborhood's charm and identity.</p> <p>Traffic and Parking: Higher density developments often lead to increased traffic congestion and parking challenges. As someone who navigates these streets daily, I am concerned about how these changes will affect our ability to move freely and safely.</p> <p>Community Engagement: I believe that meaningful community engagement is essential in shaping the future of our neighborhood. Residents like myself should have a voice and be actively involved in decisions that impact our community's future.</p>
7/10/2024	Market Neighborhood	<p>Email from Market Street Neighborhood Association Chair with specific proposed edits. See compiled document for full list.</p>



7/8/2024	Market Neighborhood	Several comment emails stated the following: Policy M-10. The vast majority of the residents in our neighborhood chose to live here because of its residential character. City Staff should recognize this and this policy should read: "Retain and enhance the residential character of the Market Neighborhood while accommodating the needs of downsizing adults, young families, and single households." Land Use Map, Figure M-3, Page 18. I understand this map will be updated at some point to match the map in the Land Use chapter. I am strongly against the proposed transit corridor on Market Street and the accompanying ¼ mile increased density push into our residential neighborhood (indeed, I am against this increased density for all of the proposed transit corridors). I have canvassed hundreds of my neighbors and none have voiced their support of this proposal. I strongly urge the planning commission to reject a Market Neighborhood map that includes this transit corridor. Policy M-12. I am against removing the references to "compatible in scale". I understand the city wants to significantly increase the density and building heights within the entire neighborhood to allow for 4-6 story building with minimal setbacks. I am strongly against all language that would allow this change. Section 9 - Priorities. I (along with many of my neighbors) strongly disagree with the change of "is" to the past-tense "was" in the second bullet. The bullet should read as follows: "It IS important to the neighborhood that existing and new regulations ensure that new development is compatible in scale and design with the existing neighborhood fabric."
7/8/2024	Market Neighborhood	Several comment emails stated the following: I am against changing the word "density" to "intensity" throughout all the neighborhood plans. It is clearly intended to confuse the reader (what is residential intensity?). It feels like the City is attempting to pull the wool over the eyes of its citizens. If Kirkland wants to increase density, the City should clearly state this. There is no need to trick us with meaningless words. The comprehensive plan does not address how significantly increasing density (or rather intensity) inside all of our residential neighborhoods impacts Kirkland's streets. Market Street and the other proposed Transit Corridors are high volume, slow-moving, (mostly) one-lane, residential roads. The plan does not address how the neighborhood streets branding off of Market Street and these proposed corridors can handle more density (e.g., lots more traffic, increased on-street parking; emergency vehicles being blocked on clogged streets, higher cut-through traffic in residential neighborhoods etc.). Market Street is not in walking distance to essential businesses like grocery stores making it difficult to reduce car reliance and accommodate reduced parking requirements. There are many existing places for high-density urban living both in Kirkland and in nearby cities. Kirkland residents have chosen Kirkland for its scale. The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan and the neighborhood plans dramatically change this. The average resident doesn't appear to even be aware of these proposed changes despite the huge impact this will have to
5/23/2024	Market Neighborhood	Some of the revisions are fine. Some of the revisions are odd. Some of the changes miss the point of the original text. Some of the revisions change the description of the neighborhood in significant ways that do not align with those who live, work, and recreate in the Market neighborhood.
5/22/2024	Market Neighborhood	Preserve neighborhood plans - Each neighborhood has its own individual style and needs. It would be a detriment to our city to lose our neighborhood plans and collective voices.
5/21/2024	Market Neighborhood	Preserve neighborhood plans - Each neighborhood has its own individual style and needs. It would be a detriment to our city to lose our neighborhood plans and collective voices.
5/20/2024	Market Neighborhood	Preserve neighborhood plans - Each neighborhood has its own individual style and needs. It would be a detriment to our city to lose our neighborhood plans and collective voices.
5/20/2024	Market Neighborhood	Preserve neighborhood plans - Each neighborhood has its own individual style and needs. It would be a detriment to our city to lose our neighborhood plans and collective voices.
8/22/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	Policy MS-7: Restore "Enhance" in the first sentence as it's appropriate that regulations be designed to result in improvements to our world rather than merely "maintain" - settling for the status quo. Restore Policy MS-8 which sets building height in the corridor to two to three stories: The City-organized and managed group that developed the current plan thoughtfully and carefully created this policy in 2020-21 and it is to be preserved rather than discarded. In current draft Policy MS-10: Remove the added sentence "These design regulations should also prioritize reducing the cost of housing and increasing sustainability." at the end of the second sentence. The consensus of residents is that Kirkland must avoid the ugly "sameness" of downtown Redmond, for example, that is being promulgated by an over-emphasis on low cost design and building materials. In current draft Policy MS-13 (on page 13 of 18 of the posted draft plan): Restore the deleted final paragraph.
7/25/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	As residents on the First Street of the Norkirk/ Market community, I am writing to oppose the proposed changes in the Market Street Corridor Plan. Specifically, we reject the extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market Street. And we want to retain the current zoning policy for this area, as increasing the building height and density, as well as extending mixed-used buildings to First Street would cause irrevocable harm to what makes this neighbor unique, and our home.
7/12/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	"ROLLING"--WHAT IS IT? The Comprehensive Plan documents use the term "rolling" repeatedly, as a transportation mode that is to be encouraged along with biking and walking. I would appreciate a definition of the term. Does "rolling" include skateboarding? Electric bikes? Electric scooters? If so, I oppose allowing "rollers" to use bike lanes or pedestrian pathways. There's already a steady stream of reports on nextdoor of electric scooter riders, most of whom are young teens, colliding with vehicles and being discourteous to pedestrians. I don't anticipate we can expect stepped-up enforcement of these riders, many of whom are unlicensed.
8/19/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	I am writing today to strongly object to the proposed Market Street Corridor Plan. Why? I understand that our amazing city is growing and is one of the most desirable places in the Seattle area to live. I also know that planning needs to happen, but the size and scope of the proposed Market Street plan works directly against the very character and livability that makes Kirkland such a desirable place to live and work! Keeping current zoning heights is a better plan. I also believe that the proposed plan will turn market street into a literal highway instead of the valuable, walkable area of the city it could still be.

7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>My wife and I, along with three kids have been residents of Kirkland for many years and we truly love the quiet family friendly neighborhood and its vibe. That is why we are very concerned about the proposed changes to:</p> <p>existing restrictions on the height and maximum occupancy of buildings along the corridor (MS-8)</p> <p>existing requirements that higher buildings have setbacks or architectural features that provide aesthetic complements to lower height or historic buildings (MS-14). This will not only make the concurrency situation even worse (with an already congested Market Street during current everyday rush hours), but it will have significant negative impact to the general appeal of the neighborhood and potentially property value as well (as lake views will be obstructed and higher density dwellings will alter the quiet family friendly single family neighborhood nature).</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>

7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market street.</li> <li>2. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of market to 24units/acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. To 2-3 stories.</li> <li>4. Retain Policy MS-14; commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</li> <li>5. Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>I agree with my neighbors (on 1st street) and urge the planning commission to reject the proposed changes in the Market Street Corridor Plan:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market Street.</li> <li>2/ Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units/acre.</li> <li>3/ RETAIN POLICY MS-8!!!</li> <li>4/ Policy MS-10: Reject proposed changes.</li> <li>5/ Retain Policy MS-14</li> <li>6/ Reject changes to Policy MS-15</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st street and West of Market</p> <p>Retain current zoning of 12 units per acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-8 which limits the height of buildings along Market Street to 2-3 stories</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, commercial buildings should compliment rather that Dominate residential homes</p> <p>Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which would cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st street and West of Market</p> <p>Retain current zoning of 12 units per acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-8 which limits the height of buildings along Market Street to 2-3 stories</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, commercial buildings should compliment rather that Dominate residential homes</p> <p>Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which would cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st street and West of Market</p> <p>Retain current zoning of 12 units per acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-8 which limits the height of buildings along Market Street to 2-3 stories</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, commercial buildings should compliment rather that Dominate residential homes</p> <p>Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which would cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>I reside on 1st and 12th avenue and will be affected by this proposal. One of the favorite parts of the neighborhood is that it is walkable, safe and has a blend of historic and architecturally consistent low-rise residential and commercial buildings. I am concerned that the proposed plan being considered deletes existing restrictions on the height and maximum occupancy of buildings along the corridor (proposed deletion of MS-8) and deletes existing requirements that higher buildings have setbacks or architectural features that provide aesthetic complements to lower height or historic buildings (proposed deletion of MS-14).</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st street and West of Market</p> <p>Retain current zoning of 12 units per acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-8 which limits the height of buildings along Market Street to 2-3 stories</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, commercial buildings should compliment rather that Dominate residential homes</p> <p>Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which would cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods</p>

7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market Street.</p> <p>Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units/acre.</p> <p>RETAIN POLICY MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market St. to 2-3 stories.</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, commercial buildings should complement rather than dominate residential homes.</p> <p>Reject proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts adjacent residential neighborhoods.</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1. Reject the extension of the Market Street Corridor to First St and to the west of Market Street.</li> <li>2. Retain the current zoning of 12-units per acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units per acre.</li> <li>3. Retain Policy MS-8, which limits the height of buildings along Market Street to 2 stories.</li> <li>4. Reject the proposed changes to Policy MS-15, which will cause adverse impacts on adjacent lower intensity residential neighborhoods.</li> <li>5. Retain Policy MS-14, which states that commercial buildings should complement, rather than dominate residential homes</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>I've just learned of the changes proposed in the market Street corridor plan. These last-minute changes concern me greatly! It is outrageous that this was not better communicated to the community. My specific concerns are the building height increase, increased housing density and reduced parking requirements.</p> <p>I urge you to please reject the proposed changes in the Market Street Corridor Plan that extend the corridor to first Street into the west of Market Street. I request that you please retain the current zoning limits in policy MS – 8 which limits the height of buildings to 2 or 3 stories, and retain Policy MS-14 regarding commercial buildings.</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market Street.</li> <li>2/ Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units/acre.</li> <li>3/ RETAIN POLICY MS-8!!!</li> <li>4/ Policy MS-10: Reject proposed changes.</li> <li>5/ Retain Policy MS-14</li> <li>6/ Reject changes to Policy MS-15</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1/ Reject extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market Street.</li> <li>2/ Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units/acre.</li> <li>3/ RETAIN POLICY MS-8!!!</li> <li>4/ Policy MS-10: Reject proposed changes.</li> <li>5/ Retain Policy MS-14</li> <li>6/ Reject changes to Policy MS-15</li> </ol>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>I would like to ask that the planning commission reject the following proposed changes in the Market Street Corridor Plan:</p> <p>Reject (for now) the extension of the Market Street Corridor to 1st street and to the west of market street - such large changes to zoning policy are fundamentally in conflict with the interests of many in this community (who still want to achieve many of the same outcomes you do)</p> <p>Retain policy MS-8, which limits heights of buildings along market street to be on-par with surrounding properties (currently 2-3 stories)</p> <p>Retain Policy MS-14, so that commerical buildings don't substantially alter the feel and aesthetic of this largely residential community</p> <p>Consider rejecting MS-15 due to its impact on the current residential neighborhoods and their residents</p>

7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	<p>We are concerned that the proposed plan being considered deletes existing restrictions on the height and maximum occupancy of buildings along the corridor (proposed deletion of MS-8) and deletes existing requirements that higher buildings have setbacks or architectural features that provide aesthetic complements to lower height or historic buildings (proposed deletion of MS-14). *We took great care and comfort in knowing the property we just heavily invested in had height restrictions to protect our investment. Had this not been in place we would have not purchased this home!!!*</p> <p>The Market Street corridor is already a heavily used arterial for residents in the Juanita neighborhood. There is only one lane in each the north and south directions and existing planning documents do not include a widening of the arterial. Indeed, the need for preservation of trees and sidewalks suggests that widening would not be feasible or possible. During afternoon and evening hours, Market Street is regularly congested with stop and go traffic extending from at least 9th Avenue to downtown Juanita. Many motorists attempt to bypass the congestion by speeding up 1st Street. A three- or four-fold increase in the occupancy along the Market Corridor would eventually add hundreds or thousands of additional residents and only increase congestion. In turn, this could result in more motorists using adjacent north-south side streets to by-pass stopped or slow traffic. The side-streets are in residential neighborhoods with young children and inattentive, speeding motorists represent a significant safety concern. Indeed, on several occasions we have observed speeding motorists nearly hit pedestrians (children) coming to/from the Tot Lot on 9th Avenue.</p> <p>Additionally, we and many other families appreciate the existing single-family residential character of our neighborhood. Many of the houses have partial views of Lake Washington that would be obscured by buildings that are higher than 25 feet above the property mid-line. The residents' property values would be significantly adversely affected by the proposed changes. Changes in the maximum occupancy without sufficient on-site parking would result in on-street parking, potentially affecting access by emergency vehicles or residential deliveries such as mail.</p> <p>In addition to safety, the aesthetic character of Kirkland is important to us as residents. We have seen the explosion of 7-story block tenement apartments in Redmond that arguably has destroyed its downtown character and creates a canyon-like feel. The proposed changes to the Comprehensive Plan do not adequately ensure that such massive mid-rise development will be rejected in the future by building planners.</p>
7/11/2024	Market street Corridor Plan	RETAIN POLICY MS-8!!! Policy MS-10: Reject proposed changes. Retain Policy MS-14. Reject changes to Policy MS-15.
7/10/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	Against proposed density increases along Market St and into the Market & Norkirk neighborhoods. Email includes specific suggested edits. See compiled document for full list.
7/10/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	Concerned with increasing the building height and density allowed in the Market Street Corridor. I'd like to see other changes considered that actually increase home ownership instead of relying on large apartment buildings owned by corporations. This neighborhood is serviced by alleyways, which facilitate DADUs and cottages. To entice SFR owners to increase the number of units we should consider incentives to make this happen. Allow FAR and land use exceptions to enable 2 and 3 bedroom cottages. Additionally, reducing parking requirements for high density buildings in this neighborhood is a safety and congestion risk. I urge the planning commission to reject the following proposed changes: Reject extension of the Market St corridor to 1st St and to the west of Market St. Retain current zoning of 12-units/acre, and limit current exceptions east of Market to 24 units/acre. Retain policy MS-8. Policy MS-10: reject proposed changes. Retain policy MS-14. Reject changes to policy MS-15.
7/9/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	From a Market Street resident - a list of Market Street Neighborhood Plan and Corridor Plan change requests. See compiled document for full list.
5/23/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	Revise Market Street Corridor Neighborhood Plan. Policy MS-06 states "Restrict the development of new commercial and large scale residential development to locations within the limited boundaries and land use districts designated for the Market Street Corridor." This language seems to contradict the language and general sentiments used in other Neighborhood Plans and the Comprehensive Plan.
5/22/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	Eliminate Market Street Corridor Plan - MS-06: This language seems to contradict the language and general sentiments used in other Neighborhood Plans and the Comprehensive Plan. The language used here is too vague and needlessly restricts future housing and/or commercial opportunities that may fall into gray areas. I personally think we should be doing the exact opposite of Policy MS-06
5/19/2024	Market Street Corridor Plan	Please restore policy MS-7 and MS-8 which are currently marked for deletion.
7/25/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	I don't know how to say this nicely but the wording in this document is almost unintelligible to us citizens. Staff needs to write so the average citizen has an idea of what you are talking about and proposing. Suggest you do a re-write of this before approving.
7/10/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	I strongly support Policy MB-32 to expand and iterate pilot programs to enhance pedestrian-only access along Park Lane.
7/7/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	First, I want to express appreciation to the Planning staff. The conversations with some KAN members which led to some minor edits in this current set of neighborhood plan documents were productive and helpful. Second, edits were made to MB-32 regarding Park Lane, which update the text to reflect the current status after the Council's 2023 motions. Personally, I would have been fine with leaving MB-32 as it was, but I also understand the relevance of referring to the Council's motions. However, I am concerned that you will receive some comments urging you to either remove MB-32 entirely or to urge you to edit the text to speak negatively about the possibilities of programs that would increase walking and rolling and decrease vehicular use of the street. I hope you will be resistant to those requests so that we can continue with this on our radar, at some point in our future, envisioning what will work well and be truly visionary and future-thinking for the entire community of those who live, work, visit or invest in Park Lane. Accordingly, I am personally supportive of either accepting the edited iteration in your packet, or reverting to the prior text, and not supportive of negativity or removal. I would love to see increased walking and rolling possibilities

6/26/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	<p>From Board of the Moss Bay Neighborhood Association:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>- In the overview, there's a note that the staff will update the 4th paragraph to reflect the anticipated 2044 capacity numbers. Recognizing that the anticipated growth in our most recent plan was already cited as an additional 4000 dwelling units (nearly double the existing) and an additional 9700 jobs (an increase of more than 50% over the existing), some of our board members are skeptical about how that will be accomplished, most especially the number of housing units. There is a desire to increase housing opportunities, but again, concerned about how that will actually happen. Bottom line on this point, we would like to know sooner rather than later about the updated numbers that will be placed in this paragraph, along with any other possible changes to the policy statements necessary to implement that growth. It would also help us to know how much of that increase (the existing #s and whatever will replace it) is in the NE 85th St Station Subarea</li> <li>- In the vision statement, 4th paragraph, there's a proposed edit to remove the word "walkable" and replace it with "human scale." Those words and concepts are not synonymous. We approve of the addition of the phrase "human-scale" and ask that "walkable" be retained because it is so important. We recognize that the words "pedestrian activity" are in the same sentence, but the area needs to be walkable in order to sustain pedestrian activity.</li> <li>- We will talk more about MB-32, Park Lane. Just as how the plan is being updated to reflect that there is now a designation as a regional growth center, it also needs to be updated to reflect the current status of Park Lane and pedestrianization (or not). The question is, how to do that.</li> </ul>
6/26/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	<p>Kirkland Downtown Alliance:</p> <ol style="list-style-type: none"> <li>1) All mentions of closing Park Lane need to be removed from the Moss Bay Comp Plan or the text needs to be clearly notated to reflect that 1) 100% of Park Lane businesses and property owners opposed the permanent closure of Park Lane; and that Council studied the proposed closure and voted to leave the road open to vehicular traffic (see 2023 Council Minutes). After spending \$100,000 on the Park Lane study it's time for the city to let this go.</li> <li>2) The efforts to organize businesses, property owners, residents and community leaders to keep Park Lane open were done by the Kirkland Downtown Alliance (I am the contact person for that group). The KDA and Chamber of Commerce were not actively involved in the fight to keep Park Lane open for commerce. The City of Kirkland contracts with the KDA to be the "Voice of the Downtown" however, they refused to take a position on the issue (presumably for fear of losing city funding). The Chamber of Commerce also did not take a firm position on the matter. Any written statement from the KDA or Chamber of Commerce on this matter would be secondary to that of the Kirkland Downtown Alliance.</li> <li>3) The Kirkland Downtown Alliance respectfully requests that it has the opportunity to review any text that the Moss Bay Neighborhood Association proposes be added to the comp plan amendments regarding Park Lane.</li> <li>4) I am hopeful that the text regarding Park Lane is an oversight and agree with your approach to remind the Planning Department of the updated status and ask them to propose updated text, consistent with the Council's action in September 2024 to keep the road open to vehicular traffic.</li> <li>5) In 2023 and 2024 when the planning department held Economic Development focus groups/workshops it was made clear by participants that Park Lane needed to remain open to vehicular traffic. In fact, the downtown businesses and property owners participated in those meetings because they wanted to ensure that the updated status of Park Lane was reflected in the comp plan amendments.</li> </ol>
6/19/2024	Moss Bay Neighborhood Plan	<p>Policy MB-32 was adopted as "Expand and iterate pilot programs to enhance pedestrian-only access along Park Lane" and then includes statements about next steps. As you know, there were next steps taken and the council stopped the process altogether and then adopted a motion about studying downtown with a robust process (I don't have my hands on the exact motion now, and I suspect you do, but let me know if you want me to find it.)</p> <p>Since we have carefully updated the plan document to reference the Greater Downtown Regional Growth Center as an actual designation as opposed to a proposed one, I'm curious to know the staff's thought process in leaving MB-32 as it was. It's a hot potato, no doubt about it, so I'm not asking you for a rewrite at this point, simply asking about the thought process in leaving it intact. If you could get back to me on Thursday, that would be ideal, so that I can provide <del>feedback to our board</del></p>
7/2/2024	Norkirk Neighborhood Plan	<p>Comments on updated Norkirk Neighborhood Plan...from Norkirk Board Member and KAN representative, Janet Pruitt:</p> <p>Since I am suggesting only two small changes, I hope it is acceptable to do this through text rather than using the Word document provided. This allows for a bit of commentary as well.</p> <p>Both suggested changes are contained in the Land Use section under "Norkirk's Innovative and eclectic design."</p> <p>In the 3rd paragraph, starting with line 2: Architecture and site design standards such as use of varied architectural styles, roof angles and proportional building mass to allow for substantial light and privacy between structures, tree retention, generous setbacks from the street and well maintained landscaping (eliminate "limited off-street parking") will ensure compatibility (eliminate use of word "synergy") with adjacent existing housing.</p>

7/25/2024	Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan	Churchhome is privately owned. From the policies cited below, it looks like the state wants to tell the church how to use its land and property. There is a separation between church and state and this is deeply disturbing. The state has no business telling a church how it should be using its land and property.  Local governments can't impose land use or zoning restrictions on churches that significantly burden their ability to worship, operate, or meet unless they can demonstrate a compelling interest and that the restriction is the least restrictive way to achieve that interest. This is known as the Religious Land Use and Integrity Protection Act (RLUIPA), which also requires governments to treat religious and secular institutions equally.
7/25/2024	Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] Suggested corrections and changes to the Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan - see cumulative comment document for full list.
6/25/2024	Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] From The Board of SRH/BT list of responses to staff-recommended edits, reactions to edits, and comments about suggested additions to the Rose Hill plan policies. See cumulative comment document for full list.
6/25/2024	Rose Hill Neighborhood Plan	[staff summary] list of responses to staff-recommended edits, reactions to edits, and comments about suggested additions to the Rose Hill plan policies. See cumulative comment document for full list.
7/26/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Opposed to Par Mac request due to business displacement and negative impacts on neighboring residential properties.
7/24/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Opposed to Par Mac request due to business displacement and negative impacts on neighboring residential properties.
7/10/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Opposes land use change submitted with the Par Mac community-initiated amendment request because there will not be enough population to support such a request, poor infrastructure, negative impact on neighborhood, and insufficient information at the City to support approval.
7/9/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Opposed to large apartments like the proposed Par Mac community-initiated amendment request do to impacts on home values.
5/23/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Proposed Par Mac CAR will bring too much traffic congestion to the neighborhood.
5/22/2024	Totem Lake Business District	Proposed Par Mac CAR is inconsistent with 2035 Comprehensive Plan and has too much of an impact on surrounding low density housing.
7/24/2024	Totem Lake Business District Plan	Reconsider Policy TL-21.2 that states "Encourage private development to help build the overall character community design elements of the Totem Lake Business District." I don't have a historical context of why the Planning Commission and City staff has singled out the Totem Lake Business District for private development-driven planning for growth. You cannot leave the design character of a neighborhood, much less a commercial district that will receive the largest and greatest density of new development to the private sector.
		<b>* See the Juanita Neighborhood Plan Update webpage and Kingsgate Neighborhood Plan Update webpages for public comments on those plans.</b>

## Utilities, Public Services, & Capital Facilities Public Comments

Date Submitted	Topics	Comment
3/14/2023	Accessibility - Parks	Parks Department needs to be mindful of accessibility issues when there is construction next to parks. For a while, people in wheelchairs could not access Kirkland Urban from Peter Kirk Park because of construction. This has come up in PFEC – they discussed parking garages at parks, but parking garages are difficult for seniors because they are dark and the short sightline. Public sidewalks have lots of root problems which is hard for people with mobility issues. The City is not addressing this. Concerned that trees are being cut down because of issues with overhead power lines.
5/23/2024	Capital Facilities	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife suggests the following policy, "Collaborate with WSDOT, King county, and neighboring jurisdictions to plan and prioritize public and private culvert upgrades to ensure fish passage barrier removal, adequate projected stormwater passage, and continued climate-related adaptations to handle water passage into the future.
4/12/2024	Climate	Puget Sound Energy (PSE) submitted an excel spreadsheet with model policy language to address climate change.
	Emergency Planning	Encourage more spaces that can become shelters in emergency conditions.
3/14/2023	Heat Pumps	She has all gas appliances. She watched the heat pump seminar but is worried about not being able to use appliances if the power goes out (concern about utility redundancy). Seniors are concerned about heat. So it doesn't make sense for her. However, after hearing from David Barnes that heat pumps filter the air (including smoke), installing a heat pump could make sense, as long as the electricity stays on.
5/23/2024	Planning	Washington Department of Fish and Wildlife: It is important to plan for utility infrastructure that will be resilient to future flooding and additional climate-related conditions. If not done so already, we highly encourage Kirkland to prioritize at-risk infrastructure as soon as possible with emphasis on areas that pose community and environmental health risks. We suggest specifying the need to consult WRIA specific salmon recovery plans, which outline specific sites for restoration consideration, specific to Kirkland and the surrounding area.
8/26/2024	School Capacity	I've been following the city hall hearings and noticed Marla Groves' comments about school capacity concerns. There are counterarguments, supported by data from Seattle, suggesting that condominium developments actually reduce school enrollments because these units aren't family-friendly. This reduction in school enrollment in Seattle's urban areas is troubling to me, as it indicates that such developments drive families away, not just from the developments themselves but from surrounding blocks as well. Families are the bedrock of our society. The urban areas in Seattle have driven families to the Eastside, and we should avoid pushing families out of Kirkland. Therefore, I support urbanization only in urban villages like Totem Lake and urge the removal of transport corridors from comprehensive plans. If we need more capacity, we can create more urban villages, which have been a success story for our town. The loss of family habitats is a major reason why many urban areas experience negative growth rates and their associated consequences
9/25/2024	School Capacity	I'm directing this message mainly to you as you sit on the Kirkland City Council steering committee with Lake Washington School District and have students in Lake Washington public schools. I received this communication this morning from Dr. Christine Bell, the principal at Lake Washington High School. This overcrowding is accelerating rapidly under the currently increased density policies the City of Kirkland and State Legislature have in place. Consider this current state of overcrowding in schools, the rapid densification of single-family neighborhoods like Rose Hill all ready and the fact that multi-family, low-income housing has all school impact fees and other fees & taxes waived which negatively impacts school operations and climate for students. If you wisely decide to NOT include a version of the hyper growth acceleration policy being proposed in the Comprehensive Plan this December, the district will continue to strain over the next 20 years as the on-the-books density and housing policies continue to bear fruit. Thank you for considering this matter.
	School Capacity	Remove regulatory barriers to expand school capacity
7/28/2023	Services - Trash	More Garbage Cans and Recycling receptacles
8/30/2023	Safety	Take safety into consideration as the city grows and gets denser. More street lighting.



5/22/204	Safety/Traffic	<p>With increasing frequency, vehicles are blocked from driving on our streets. Multiple times I have watched the school bus back down the hill near me for almost 1/4 mile, back that long bus into an uncontrolled intersection, turn around, and seek another route. The waste management trucks face the same fate. If an EMT or fire truck encounters that blockage, the result will be tragic. Why is this happening? At least 2 reasons: 1.New construction is making the streets more narrow. For example: Builders remove the gravel parking strips along the street and push the curbs out into the street. Rarely do they give up right-of-way and pull the curbs into the property to make room. Sometimes there is less than 8' of travel lane. (Fire trucks are 8-10' wide.) 2.On-street parking is exploding because of increased density, reduced off-street parking requirements, and smaller driveways. This is a very dangerous mix. This Comp Plan update will make this situation worse and I don't see anything in the Transportation plan that will fix this problem. This Comp Plan's bold vision for increased density needs to include bold infrastructure plans to handle the growth.</p>
5/22/2024	Utilities/Environment	<p>I often wonder why no one ever questions the ecological factors of all this overdevelopment. There are already developments that the city has snuck into nooks and crannies that were green and most likely had trees (cleaning and cooling our air). Adding thousands of people (and double the number of cars) is a HUGE contributor to global warming. All the concrete structures hold and retain heat that is emitted into the environment. All these people will need water and lots of it. The quality of our current tap water will decline since it is not sustainable to support. All these people will need electricity. All these people will need heat/air conditioning.</p> <p>All these people will be sitting in their cars clogging up the roads. So much for a Green Environment in Washington State. Kirkland, Redmond, Bothell, Woodinville. All of these were sustainable, nice communities. Suburban not Urban. Can you explain how you perceive the ecological impact? Can you tell me how you support this?</p>
9/4/2024	Utilities Planning	<p>I believe that new zoning laws should be more detailed. The plan for utilities and services required for higher density should be part of the plan. The plan in its current state would play into hands of builders and developers who have no skin in the game, other than increasing the cost of living for residents</p>