

RESOLUTION NO. - R-2823

A RESOLUTION OF THE CITY COUNCIL OF THE CITY OF KIRKLAND APPROVING THE ISSUANCE OF A PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT FOR "PARKPLACE" AS APPLIED FOR IN DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT FILE NO. PP-PF-81-18 (AMENDMENT), BY CUMBERLAND NORTHWEST, INC. TO RELOCATE THE FOOD MARKET AND TO ADD 1600 SQUARE FEET OF DRUG STORE USE AND TO RELOCATE TWO FLOORS OF OFFICE SPACE TO THE CENTRAL OFFICE BUILDING AND TO LOWER THE OVERALL PROJECT FOUR FEET BEING WITHIN A PLANNED AREA 4 ZONE, AND SETTING FORTH CONDITIONS TO WHICH SUCH PRELIMINARY AND FINAL PLANNED UNIT DEVELOPMENT AMENDMENT SHALL BE SUBJECT.

WHEREAS, the Department of Community Development has received an application for a Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Amendment filed by Cumberland Northwest, Inc., the owner of said property described in said application and located within a Planned Area 4 zone.

WHEREAS, the application has been submitted to the Kirkland Planning Commission who held hearings thereon at their regular meetings of April 16, 1981 and April 30, 1981, and

WHEREAS, pursuant to City of Kirkland Ordinance No. 0-2473 concerning environmental policy and the State Environmental Policy Act, an environmental checklist has been submitted to the City of Kirkland, reviewed by the responsible official of the City of Kirkland and a negative declaration reached, and

WHEREAS, said environmental checklist and declaration have been available and accompanied the application through the entire review process, and

WHEREAS, the Kirkland Planning Commission after their public hearings and consideration of the recommendations of the Department of Community Development and having available to them the environmental checklist and negative declaration did adopt certain Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations and did recommend approval of the Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development subject to the specific conditions set forth in said recommendations, and

WHEREAS, the City Council, in regular meeting, did consider the environmental documents received from the responsible official, together with the recommendation of the Planning Commission.

NOW, THEREFORE, BE IT RESOLVED by the City Council of the City of Kirkland as follows:

Section 1. The Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations of the Kirkland Planning Commission as signed by the Chairperson thereof and filed in the Department of Community Development File No. PP-PF-81-18 (Amendment) are adopted by the Kirkland City Council as though fully set forth herein.

Section 2. The Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Amendment shall be issued to the applicant subject to the conditions set forth in the Recommendations hereinabove adopted by the City Council.

Section 3. A certified copy of this Resolution, together with the Findings, Conclusions and Recommendations therein adopted shall be attached to and become a part of the Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Amendment or evidence thereof delivered to the permittee.

Section 4. Nothing in this resolution shall be construed as excusing the applicant from compliance with any federal, state or local statutes, ordinances or regulations applicable to this project, other than expressly set forth herein.


Section 5. Failure on the part of the holder of the permit to initially meet or maintain strict compliance with the standards and conditions to which the Preliminary and Final Planned Unit Development Amendment is subject shall be grounds for revocation in accordance with Ordinance No. 2183, the Kirkland Zoning Ordinance.

Section 6. Certified or conformed copies of this Resolution shall be delivered to the following:

- (a) Applicant
- (b) Department of Community Development of the City of Kirkland
- (c) Fire and Building Departments of the City of Kirkland
- (d) Public Service Department of the City of Kirkland
- (e) Department of Project and Construction Management of the City of Kirkland
- (f) The Office of the Director of Administration and Finance (ex officio City Clerk) for the City of Kirkland.

Passed by majority vote of the Kirkland City Council on the 4th day of May, 1981.

SIGNED IN AUTHENTICATION THEREOF on the 4th day of May, 1981.

Mayor 

ATTEST:

  
Director of Administration and Finance  
(Ex officio City Clerk)

4992A



DEPARTMENT OF COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

ADVISORY REPORT  
FINDINGS, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

\_\_\_ PREPARED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_  
XX RECOMMENDED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE April 30, 1981  
\_\_\_ ADOPTED BY \_\_\_\_\_ DATE \_\_\_\_\_

\_\_\_ STAFF \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ BOARD OF ADJUSTMENT \_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_ HOUGHTON COMMUNITY COUNCIL \_\_\_\_\_  
XX PLANNING COMMISSION Carol Goddard  
\_\_\_ CITY COUNCIL AS INCORPORATED IN Carol Goddard, Chairperson

\_\_\_ RESOLUTION \_\_\_\_\_ ORDINANCE \_\_\_\_\_  
NUMBER \_\_\_\_\_  
DATE \_\_\_\_\_

FILE NUMBER PP-PF-81-18 (Amendment)  
APPLICANT Cumberland Northwest, Inc.  
PROPERTY LOCATION East of Peter Kirk Park, south of Central Way, west of 6th St., and north of Kirkland Way

SUBJECT Amendment to Approved Final Planned Unit Development of "Kirkland Parkplace"

HEARING/MEETING DATE May 4, 1981

BEFORE Kirkland City Council

EXHIBITS ATTACHED See list on reverse, Exhibits "A" through "V"  
\_\_\_\_\_  
\_\_\_\_\_

LIST OF EXHIBITS

- "A" - Applications
- "B" - Declarations of Non-Significance and Environmental Checklists
- "C" - Vicinity Map
- "D" - Approved Site Plan
- "E1" - Approved Elevations
- "E2" - Approved Elevations
- "F" - Proposed Site Plan
- "G" - Proposed 1st Level Floor Plan
- "H" - Elevations and Sections
- "I" - Revised Sanitary and Storm Sewer Plan
- "J" - Partial Display Model of Market Relocation
- "K1" - Colored Rendering of the Market from Park
- "K2" - Colored Rendering of the Market from Old Coast-To-Coast Store
- "L" - Landscaping and Pedestrian Walkway in Park
- "M" - Ron Hopper Letter Dated April 3, 1981 Addressing Vehicle Circulation for the Market Relocation
- "N" - Bob Miulli Letter Dated March 30, 1981 Addressing the Market Relocation
- "O1" - Approved Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation Plan
- "O2" - Proposed Vehicular and Pedestrian Circulation Plan
- "P1" - Approved Parking and Building Mass
- "P2" - Proposed Parking and Building Mass
- "Q" - Park Board Meeting Notes Dated March 18, 1981
- "R" - Revised Proposed Elevations and Sections
- "S" - Perspective from West- This exhibit is on file with DCD and will be shown at the hearing.
- "T" - Ted Shultz letter dated 4/24/81
- "U" - Approved Perspective: West
- "V" - Bill Hufty Letter dated 4/30/81

) These exhibits  
) are on file  
) with the Depart-  
) ment of Community  
) Development and  
) will be show  
) at the hearing

I. SUMMARY

A. DESCRIPTION OF PROPOSED ACTION

Cumberland Northwest, Inc. has applied for two amendments to the recently approved Parkplace Planned Unit Development. The first amendment, hereafter identified as Amendment 1, is to relocate the food market to the northwest so as to sit 20 feet from Peter Kirk Park and to add 1600 square feet of drug store use. The second amendment, hereafter identified as Amendment 2, is to relocate 28,800 square feet of office floor area by increasing the central office structure two levels in height and by reducing both the northern restaurant structure and the southern drug store structure one level in height; to lower all of the Parkplace buildings by 4 feet; and to lower the central office building roof. With the proposed amendments, the central office building height will be increased 9 feet, the restaurant height will be decreased 19 feet and the drug store height will be decreased 14 feet. The square footage of food market use and office space use will not be increased. Associated with the two amendments will be minor revisions to the internal circulation, on-site parking, pedestrian walkways and landscaping. The property is located east of Peter Kirk Park, south of Central Way, west of 6th Street and north of Kirkland Way. The site is zoned Planned Area 4 and is designated in the Land Use Policies Plan for commercial use. The applicant received final approval for the Parkplace P.U.D. on February 2, 1981. The application was continued from the April 16, 1981 meeting in order to enable the applicant to submit additional materials clarifying the roofline and facade detail of the central office structure.

The major issues are: (A) the relocation of the market and the addition of drug store use; and (B) the relocation of the office floor area and the reduction in building heights.

B. RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the major issues, facts, conclusions and Exhibits "A" through "V", contained herein, we hereby recommend approval of Amendments 1 and 2 of this application, subject to the following conditions:

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/hk

R-2823

1. This application is subject to the various requirements contained in the Land Use Policies Plan and the Kirkland Zoning Ordinance. It is the responsibility of the applicant to assure compliance with the various provisions contained in these ordinances.
2. Prior to the issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Permit, the applicant shall:
  - a. Submit a detailed landscape and pedestrian walkway plan to the Park Board for their approval showing the specific placement, size, caliper and species of vegetation for the west, north and south sides of the market, and the width and specific location of the walkways along all sides of the market (see Exhibits "F", "L" and "Q").
  - b. Install the approved landscape plan around the market and parking lots (see Exhibits "F" and "L").
  - c. Install the concrete pedestrian walkways along the north, south and east sides of the market on the subject property and the adjoining sidewalk directly west of the market in Peter Kirk Park (see Exhibits "F" and "L").
  - d. Submit a two-year maintenance security device in the amount of 30% of the cost of all the landscaping (see Exhibit "F").
3. The applicant may submit a revised site plan of the plaza to have a combination elevation/clock tower and stairs instead of the approved escalator next to the northern restaurant structure for Department of Community Development review and approval.

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

## II. BACKGROUND

### A. SITE

The land is generally flat except for a slight increase in elevation on the south and east sides of the property. Drainage is to the north and west. The project will incorporate and accentuate the grade differential between the eastern and western portions of the site. The soils are silty sands with gravel interbedded with clay silts. A minimum of fill material exists except in the southwest portion of the site where 3 to 10 ½ feet of fill can be found. Vegetation on the property consists primarily of scrub growth, shrubs and some larger trees.

### B. HISTORY OF SITE

The Preliminary Planned Unit Development was approved on August 4, 1980 (PP-80-41). The Final Planned Unit Development received approval on February 2, 1981 (PF-80-94).

### C. NEIGHBORHOOD

To the north is Central Way and an area zoned Central Business District. To the east is Planned Area 5(B), an area zoned for Professional Office or RM-1800. Directly south is the Coast-To-Coast Store and further south is an area zoned Professional Office. To the west is Peter Kirk Memorial Park.

## III. MAJOR ISSUES, FACTS AND CONCLUSIONS

### A. RELOCATION OF THE MARKET AND THE ADDITION OF DRUG STORE USE.

#### 1. Statements of Fact

- a. The applicant proposes to relocate the food market from its approved location between the west block of buildings to a position slightly to the north and west adjacent to the park and to add 1600 square feet to the approved drug store. Unchanged are the height of the market at 23 feet and the square foot-

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

age of the market at 18,480 square feet. The market height will be 23 feet as measured to the peak of the pitched roof, but only 12 feet to the top of the building wall. The market will be located 20 feet from the south property line adjacent to an existing utility easement (see Exhibits "B", "D", "E", "F", "G", "H", "I", "J", "K" and "N").

- b. The applicant indicates the necessity to relocate the market because of a restrictive easement covering Tax Lots 32, 34, and 66 on a portion of the site adjacent to the existing Coast-To-Coast store. This easement does not allow any retail food store or bakery within its limits. As explained in Mr. Miulli's letter dated March 30, 1981, both the easement and the Coast-To-Coast property are under the ownership of Albertson's, Inc. which formerly operated a grocery store in this location (see Exhibit "N").
- c. To take advantage of the available space south of the drug store which results from relocating the market and to provide more retail service for local residences, the applicant requests a 1600 square foot increase for the drug store space (see Exhibits "B", "F" and "G").
- d. The applicant has examined two other alternative locations on the site for the market, but contends that the proposed location adjacent to the park is the most feasible and appropriate. The applicant feels that due to the parking layout, traffic flow and retail locations in the Parkplace project the placement of the market adjacent to Peter Kirk Park is the best location (see Exhibit "N").

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk



- e. The Kirkland Park Board, on March 18, 1981 approved the location of the market adjacent to the Park. The Park Board also reviewed and approved a landscape and pedestrian walkway design for integrating the proposed location of the market with the park. The Park Board recommends landscaping along the west, south and north sides of the market and on the existing berm along the west side of the market; pedestrian walkways on the north and south sides of the market continuing across the park; and a passive sitting area on the west side of the market in the park (see Exhibits "L" and "Q").
- f. The applicant has agreed to install the landscaping and pedestrian walkways on the subject property, and the passive sitting area and adjoining walkways to the market on the park property as approved by the Park Board. The City would install the pedestrian walkways from the passive sitting area to the Senior Center and to the other recreational areas in the park (see Exhibits "F" and "L").
- g. The west wall of the market adjacent to the park will have no openings or appurtenances. It would provide a backdrop to block the wind for people sitting in the passive recreation area next to the market. A design objective of the wall would be to help create a sense of somewhat sheltered enclosure oriented to the westerly views and sun (see Exhibits "H", "J", "K", "L", and "Q").
- h. Relocation of the food market will reduce the concentration of building mass along the west and east sides of the Parkplace project. As viewed from the north, the relocation of the market will not add a substantial amount of building mass because the restaurant in the northwest corner will block most of

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

the market in its new location. As viewed from the south, the relocation will add some additional building mass (see Exhibits "B", "E", "H", "L", and "N").

- i. Due to the relocation of the market, there will be minor revisions to the internal circulation, on-site parking, pedestrian walkways and landscaping (see Exhibits "B" and "F").
- j. Vehicular circulation on the lower level will be changed from two to one through driving lanes between the market and the drug store. The number of pedestrian/vehicular conflict points in the lower parking area where accidents and congestion can occur will be reduced from four to two (see Exhibits "D" and "O").
- k. Entrance to the market will be on the northeast or southeast corner of the building facing towards the drug store (see Exhibit "F").
- l. The applicant proposes patterned crosswalks between the market and the drug store to insure pedestrian safety while crossing the driving lane. A service/pick-up zone is proposed in front of the market allowing passengers to unload directly in front of the market without blocking the access lane (see Exhibits "F", "L" and "N").
- m. Service delivery functions are proposed on the south side of the market next to the parking lot. The service delivery area will be screened by a wall (see Exhibits "F" and "H").
- n. Pedestrian circulation will now be available along the south side of the drug store and along the north and south sides of the market for access to and from the park and Senior Center. The previously approved project linked the east and west sides of the Park-

place project with only a pedestrian path through the loading area next to the market. The points of pedestrian/vehicular conflict where accidents and congestion can occur are reduced from four to two (see Exhibits "F" and "O").

- o. The long, expansive lower parking lot will be divided into three smaller lots. Parking will be available on the north and south sides of the market for food shoppers. Landscaping will be provided around the perimeter of the parking lots (see Exhibits "F" and "P").
- p. The number of parking stalls will be reduced by 16 from the approved 899 to 883. The drug store expansion of 1600 square feet will require 4 additional parking stalls. However, the Parkplace project, including the additional drug store space, requires only 803 parking stalls. So, there still will be an additional 80 extra stalls provided (see Exhibits "B", "D", "F" and "P").

## 2. Conclusions

- a. The proposed relocation of the market is the most economically feasible and legally acceptable location for the applicant. Parking and traffic patterns are more desirable with the market relocation.
- b. The relocation of the market can be integrated into the adjacent park. The west wall of the market will be used as a backdrop for the proposed sitting area. Pedestrian circulation will be enhanced to and from the park and the Senior Center. Landscaping and the existing berm will soften the effect of the market adjacent to the park and will add additional vegetation to the site.

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

- c. The relocation of the market will improve the overall appearance of the Parkplace project. The architectural building mass along the west side of the project as previously approved would be megastructural (one large mass). In contrast, by moving the market this mass is broken up and the architectural character becomes more compositional. This would be in keeping with a more human scaled building environment such as downtown Kirkland (see Exhibits "P1" and "P2").
- d. The small addition of drug store space will provide more retail use for customer convenience and service, but will not affect the overall appearance or building mass of the Parkplace project.
- e. Vehicular circulation in the lower parking area will be improved because the points of conflict between the pedestrians and the cars will be reduced. Through traffic across the lower parking area will be reduced and pedestrian safety will be increased because of having one through vehicular access instead of two. One access lane will reduce the attractiveness of using the lower parking area as a short-cut between Central Way and Kirkland Way.
- f. Pedestrian circulation and safety on the site, and between the Parkplace project and the park and Senior Center will be improved because more walkways will be provided and the area between the drug store and Coast-To-Coast store will be open for pedestrian access between the east and west sides of the project.
- g. Through pedestrian traffic from Peter Kirk Park, across the site and to the other properties in Planned Area 4 will be enhanced by the relocation of the market (see Exhibits "O1" and "O2"). Instead of walking through a

constricted service area between the market (old location) and the Coast-To-Coast, the pedestrian linkage would now be through a much more open and direct route.

- h. Pedestrian safety is also improved because parking lots are provided directly adjacent to the market. Market shoppers will not have to cross a major driving lane while patronizing the market.
- i. Delivery services to the south side of the market will be adequately screened by a wall.
- j. To insure the installation of the approved landscaping and pedestrian walkway plans, the applicant should complete the landscaping and sidewalk construction prior to issuance of a Certificate of Occupancy Permit as outlined in Condition 2.

B. RELOCATION OF THE 28,800 SQUARE FEET OF OFFICE FLOOR AREA AND REDUCTION IN BUILDING HEIGHTS

1. Statements of Fact

- a. The applicant proposes to relocate 28,800 square feet of office floor area by increasing the central office structure two levels in height and reducing both the northern restaurant and the southern drug store structure one level in height. The central office building will be increased from the approved four levels to six levels. The restaurant will be decreased from the approved three levels to two levels. The drug store will be decreased from the approved two levels to one level (see Exhibits "A", "B", "E", "F", "H" and "R").

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

- b. The applicant's letter dated March 20, 1981 (see Exhibit "A") stated that the central office building height would be increased by 12 feet, the restaurant height would be decreased by 11 feet, and the drug store height would be decreased by 14 feet. Since then, the roofs for the central office building and the restaurant have been lowered and the overall height of the project has been lowered four feet. Thus, the height of the central office will only increase by 9 feet; the restaurant will decrease by as much as 19 feet; and the drug store will be lowered by 14 feet (see Exhibit "F").
- c. The applicant proposes to modulate the roofline of the central office building. The top (sixth) floor will recess inward on each side of the building. However, the same brick and blue metal materials for facade treatment will be used as previously approved (see Exhibits "R" and "S").
- d. The building footprint, total floor area and floor-area ratios for the Parkplace project will remain unchanged (see Exhibits "A", "F" and "G").
- e. Relocation of the office space over the drug store is proposed to provide marketable offices with a view. The relocation of the market blocks the view from the office space over the drug store (see Exhibit "F").
- f. Relocation of the office space above the restaurant is proposed because of the awkward office configuration and difficult access to the space that results from the placement of the restaurant ventilation equipment (see Exhibit "G").

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

- g. The relocation of the office space is being proposed to achieve a more efficient building design. More office space will be centrally located in the central office building and the central office elevator will be more fully utilized (see Exhibits "A", "D", "F" and "H").
- h. The relocation of the office space is also being proposed to avoid having a two-level structure in a location where poor soils will require a pile foundation. The drug store is located in an area of poor soils. However, a one-story structure on poor soils can be built with conventional footings instead of pile foundations. Using conventional footings represents a substantial savings in construction costs (see Exhibits "A" - Mr. Shultz letter dated March 20, 1981 and "F").
- i. Adding two floors to the central office building will require the fire safety systems be upgraded due to the additional height (see Exhibit "A").
- j. The applicant also proposes a four foot reduction in building elevation for all structures in the Parkplace project to balance the amount of cut and fill on the site and to reduce the height of the market's west wall at the request of the Park Board (see Exhibits "A", "H" and "Q").

## 2. Conclusions

- a. Relocating the office space will have only a minor impact on the overall design of the Parkplace project. The central office building height will only be raised 9 feet in height.

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk

- b. The proposed roofline of the central office building will provide a solution that will soften the mass of the building, establish architectural uniqueness for the structure and reflect the colors, material and detail of the other buildings.
- c. The facade of the central office building will have a similar appearance as previously approved; the same facade materials will be used.
- d. Relocation of the office space to the central office building will solve the design and marketability problems of the office space location. Views from one office space will no longer be blocked and inconvenient access to the other office space will be eradicated.
- e. Relocating the office space to the central office building will upgrade the fire safety system, centralize the office space more efficiently and more fully utilize the central office building elevator.
- f. Lowering the height of the Parkplace project by four feet will improve the views from all directions over the site. In particular, lowering the height of the project will reduce the impact of the west building mass on the adjacent park.
- g. Views over the central office building will not significantly change. The approved four level building would block views from all sides, thus the proposed six level building will not alter the view situation (see Exhibit "H").
- h. Views from all sides of the Parkplace project will be improved with the four foot reduction in overall building heights, and in particular, the 14 foot reduction of the drug store height and the 19 foot reduction in the restaurant structure height (see Exhibits "A", "H", "J" and "K").



- i. Lowering the drug store by 14 feet and lowering the market and the remainder of the Parkplace project by 4 feet will reduce the impact of the west building mass on the park (see Exhibits "H", "J", "K" and "L").

#### IV. ALTERNATIVES

- a. The Planning Commission may choose to approve a five level instead of the requested six level central office building.
- b. The Planning Commission may choose to deny the relocation of the office space keeping the central office building at four levels.

#### V. STATE ENVIRONMENTAL POLICY ACT (SEPA) REVIEW

##### 1. Statements of Fact

- a. The applicant has submitted an Environmental Checklist for each amendment that received Final Declarations of Non-Significance from the Responsible Official on February 17, 1981 and March 23, 1981 (see Exhibit "B").
- b. Conclusions

The applicant has complied with the requirements of the State Environmental Policies Act. Due to the Declaration of Non-Significance, an Environmental Impact Statement is not required for the proposed Planned Unit Development amendments.

#### VI. APPENDICES

Exhibits "A" through "V" are attached as part of this report.

4/30/81 (P.C.)  
4/23/81 (Staff)  
4703A/4/6/81/bk