

Minutes, Kirkland Alliance of Neighborhoods
May 8, 2024 Hybrid meeting: [online](#) and Peter Kirk room

Note: Action items are highlighted in **yellow**.

Neighborhoods attending:

Central Houghton	Lisa McConnell
Everest	
Evergreen Hill	Johanna Palmer
Finn Hill	Bill Blanchard (KAN co-chair elect)
Highlands	Gary Bustinduy
Juanita Neighborhoods	Margaret Bouniol
Lakeview	Aaron Jacobson (KAN co-chair, retiring)
Market	Ken Mackenzie, Liz Hunt
Moss Bay	Jeanne Large
Norkirk	
North Rose Hill	Susan Davis
South Rose Hill/Bridle Trails	Deirdre Johnson, Chris Kagen (KAN secretary)

City Staff/Elected Officials attending:

- Erika Mascorro, Diversity, Equity, Inclusion, and Belonging Manager
- John Tymczyszyn, City Council
- Adam Weinstein, Director of Planning and Building
- Alison Zike, Deputy Planning Director
- LeAndra Baker-Lewis, Senior Planner

Guests:

- Sheila Cloney, Norkirk
- Catie Malik, Houghton
- Tom Pendergrass, Kiwanis
- Sue Contreras, Moss Bay

7:02pm Introduction

- Chair Aaron Jacobson called the meeting to order
- Round-the-horn introductions

7:06pm Public comments

- Sheila Cloney, Kirkland Mainstreet
 - Preservation-based economic development program
 - Not landmark preservation, and not affiliated with the Kirkland Downtown Association or Chamber of Commerce
 - January 04, 024: A collection of Kirkland business gained non-profit status as a Mainstreet program (as many other WA cities have done)
 - Happy to share contact and information

- Tom Pendergrass, Kiwanis
 - Encourage support for Kirkland youth
 - [Susan] What is the City Council doing with KTUB?

7:10pm Officer elections

- Aaron Jacobson presenting
- Nominations
 - Aaron declining nomination for co-chair
 - Bea Nahon not running for co-chair
 - Bill Blanchard nominated by Aaron, seconded by Joanna
 - Unanimous favor
 - No nomination for second co-chair
 - Chris Kagen nominated by Joanna, seconded by Lisa
 - Unanimous favor

7:14pm Comprehensive Plan updates, Neighborhood Plan updates, Neighborhood Plan update process

- Alison Zike and Adam Weinstein presenting
- Aaron sent in advance a link to the City Council 5/3/24 retreat agenda with notes on [proposed revisions to the Comprehensive Plan and neighborhood plans](#)
 - [K2044 Comprehensive Plan Update Webpage](#)
 - Sign up for [Comp Plan Update email alerts](#)
 - Sign up for [Planning Commission agenda alerts](#) (this links to a page where you can sign up for multiple alerts)
- Key themes
 - Housing is one of the biggest topics, especially with state initiatives coming into play
- Timelines, schedules
 - Upcoming: Four [public hearings](#)
 - See the agendas on that site or on the Planning Commission website
- Growth targets
 - 2044: add 13,200 housing units, 26,490 jobs
 - Need to show allocation of diverse housing for affordability
 - 10% single-family housing for people earning 120% or more of average median income
 - 11% multiplex housing for 51-120% AMI
 - 79% apartments for 0-50% AMI
 - [Susan] How do we encourage developers to build for 0-50% AMI?
 - We have affordable housing developers who have augmenting support, such as ARCH
 - [Adam] We are making some zoning changes to support transit-oriented development (TOD) and other innovations
 - The state requires that we establish policy for all of this affordable housing, not that we actually get it built. We try to get it done through partnerships
 - [Jeanne] How is the state holding cities accountable to these comp plans?

- King County reviews the plans and can reject them, require changes. WA Dept of Commerce can do the same thing.
 - [Chris] How do ADUs fit these housing models?
 - ADUs don't match to income levels. Some ADUs are being "condo-ized" and sold for \$1M; others are being rented.
 - [Lisa] Do these housing targets address the concept of ownership as a path to building wealth?
 - No. State and county have policies to support entry-level home ownership, and we'll respond as they roll out those programs.
- HB 1110 compliance: increasing density of housing through zoning changes
 - State law, allowing up to 6 units per existing lot
 - Example: low-density zoning has gone from 6 units/acre to 36 units/acre
 - Could trigger changes in height requirements, lot coverage, etc. – Planning Dept is still considering how to comply with the new state law
 - [Lisa] Need to have transportation planning that supports increased density
 - [Allison] We have employment targets as well. Need to demonstrate that we're balancing density and transportation for that as well. We'll certainly concentrate development along existing transit corridors as well as projecting new transit motions.
 - [Susan] Low-income senior housing is an example of a demographic that is probably not straining our roadways; more likely to be taking public transit and not commuting daily
 - [Deirdre] Parking is an issue. [Adam] Builders are providing more parking that required in many cases. Housing in Kirkland is typically built with garages, but people might fill them up with possessions rather than cars. [Gary and Liz] There are plenty of places where there's not enough parking built, and street parking is problematic.
- Land use studies
 - Comprehensive Plan will establish policy, but land use and zoning changes require community-initiated amendment requests (CARs) or Council/Planning Commission action
 - Comp Plan will be high-level, not include specific densities/intensities, maximum building heights, setbacks, etc.
 - Zoning Code amendments will be needed to implement policy and will involve public comment opportunities
 - Transportation Strategic Plan is part of the Comp Plan, and needs to support all of the proposed policy changes
 - [Adam] We can't just build more road capacity, so we have to get innovative about transit, bike, ped, other mobility solutions
 - [Susan] How do we get developers in key areas, like the Petco site on 85th St., to get moving? [Adam] We tried to keep that project moving, but those permits have expired.

- If we were to develop everything that could be developed, we'd have significant surplus capacity (6,340 housing units and 858 jobs beyond the 2044 targets)
- Neighborhood Plan amendments [LeAndra]
 - Advancing the diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) principles. Specific goals for changes:
 - Equity
 - 2022 ECONorthwest Equity Review as guideline for equitable planning, guided by our 5-year DEIB roadmap
 - Consistency
 - Make plans more accurate; mostly just terminology changes
 - Efficiency
 - Increase accessibility of the plan
 - Remove language that is regulatory in nature, as the Neighborhood Plans are not regulatory (examples: geologically hazardous areas, tree standards, specific design regulations, units per acre)
 - Remove policies that are applicable citywide
 - Consolidate historical text: Highlight the rich history of Kirkland in an accurate and inclusive way. Build from the Kirkland Native History document.
 - General amendments to apply to all neighborhoods (calling these elements out specifically for discussion)
 - “Community character”
 - Change from “community character, neighborhood character, neighborhood identity” to “urban design, physical features, community design,” etc.
 - Existing wording has historically been non-inclusive
 - Compatible land uses
 - Switch emphasis to land uses that function efficiently together and are supportive of one another
 - Also historically non-inclusive in principle
 - Noted in the Equity Review as a barrier to development
 - Comments
 - [Lisa] Not in favor of stripping “neighborhood character” throughout. Understood that we need to remove exclusionary language. But there really are neighborhood identities, unique flavors to the places where we live. Kirkland is not a “monospecies.”
 - [Allison] Yes, we would all describe each neighborhood differently from each other. For example, the Cross-Kirkland Corridor (CKC) is the backbone of Houghton, which wouldn't apply to Finn Hill.
 - [Adam] We do still want to capture what's special about each neighborhood.

- Removing the word “neighborhood” from the city’s vocabulary?
 - No, and we still want to capture what’s unique about neighborhoods
 - [Chris] I understand the need to remove non-inclusive language. I would not like to see Bridle Trails characterized as a neighborhood of white, middle- and upper-class residents. But I want to preserve the information that Bridle Trails supports the existence of horse lots, with barns and trails and access. If we’re not using the term “neighborhood character” when we refer to that, then is that kind of information still to be in the Comp Plan?
 - [Adam] Yes, we do want to preserve what’s unique. That could be called urban design, community design, or other things, but we still want it in the Plan.
 - [Ken] I’m hearing frustration and anger about the process as much as the Comp Plan content. What can we do to ensure that people (including KAN and Neighborhood Associations) have appropriate opportunity for input? By the time we get the rewritten Comp Plan sections, it’ll be too late to review and have meaningful feedback.
 - [Adam] We’ll take comments on the neighborhood plan sections after the public comment period. And we’re not really changing the substance of the plans, although I recognize that the wording changes seem significant.
 - [Margaret] In my neighborhood plan update process, I saw many changes that simply eliminated redundant information, which is good.
 - [Lisa] We need clear guidelines for the process for review and comment. It is not yet clear. And doing 13 neighborhood updates at the same time every 10 years sounds difficult.
- Neighborhood Plan Update process: interim requests between Comp Plan cycles
 - Annual process open to all, at no/low cost
 - Similar to CAR process, but key differences in application
 - Planning Commission makes recommendations on which requests make it to the Planning Work Program, and Council makes final decision for adoption
 - Changes drafted by staff and reviewed for adoption with annual Comp Plan amendments
 - More detail on the process and criteria are TBD
- Questions
 - [Lisa] Under CAR requirements, I have to notify everyone who can be affected by it. That would be onerous for a neighborhood association (NA).
 - [Adam] We wouldn’t require that for an NA.
 - [Susan] Perhaps we would need those big posted signs to increase awareness when requesting a neighborhood update

- [Lisa] We need detailed scheduling for how to get on the Work Program.
- [Gary] How do we look at the proposed changes before the 5/23 public meeting?
 - [Alison] Notification will go out on the Planning Commission listserv and be posted on the city website. I'll also send a copy of the notification to Aaron for forwarding to KAN.

9:02pm Calendar update and miscellaneous

- Diversity, equity, inclusion, and belonging (DEIB) training
 - POSTPONED to June.
- Neighborhood Association articles and bylaws
 - [Bea] Still trying to get a bid from a legal firm to develop a template that neighborhoods could use, rather than the huge guideline doc from the state
 - Might have a volunteer to hold a KAN workshop for training
- State legislative updates
 - POSTPONED.
- Survey results
 - Deadline is the Saturday before the June mtg
 - Aaron will present the results in June
- IRS 990N
 - **Please file if you haven't yet!** Due 5/15/24. Four neighborhoods pending

--pm Roundtable — Not done

- Everest
- Evergreen Hill
- Finn Hill
- Highlands
- Houghton
- Juanita
- Lakeview
- Market
- Moss Bay
- Norkirk
- North Rose Hill/BT
- Totem Lake

9:07pm Closing

- Adjourned at 9:07pm
- Next meeting is June 12, 2024