

#	Party of Interest	Public Comment (Summary & Link)	City Response (Summary & Link)
1	Marcia Acree	<p>Building Height: Concerned that 6 stories is too high; would like a 4-story height limit.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Building Height: Development standards, including building height limitations, are established by the Kenmore Municipal Code (KMC). The proposed development complies with the building height requirements established in the KMC.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 11/7/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
2	Jim Howard	<p>Landscaping: Has questions about the future right-of-way and landscape buffer on the northern property line; proposed an alternative access roadway.</p> <p>Access: Proposes an alternative option for access roadway.</p> <p>Design Standards: Has questions on how the project meets various design standards.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Landscaping: Development standards, including landscaping requirements, are established in KMC 18.35. Plans provided at this stage are conceptual and appear to proposed an alternative landscape plan (allowed by code). Comments regarding native plants have been provided to the applicant; a revised landscape plan is anticipated at resubmittal.</p> <p>Access: The future access roadway is a requirement of the Comprehensive Plan (Figure T-23). Changing the location of the future roadway would require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, and would not impact the Larus project, which is already vested to current code.</p> <p>Design Standards: In a planning correction letter from the City dated 12/2/2024, additional information and/or corrections are required relating to design standards. Additional information will be available on design standards when the applicant resubmits (typically within 90 days of the correction letter).</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 11/7/2024 and 12/16/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
3	Elizabeth Mooney	<p>Trees and the Environment: Is concerned about removal of exceptional trees, impacts to wildlife, wetlands, climate change, heat islands, and air quality.</p>	<p>Trees and the Environment: Tree removal limitations, including removal of exceptional trees, are established by the Kenmore Municipal Code (KMC). The proposed development appears to comply with the tree removal requirements established in the KMC however, additional information is required as part of the first review comments. Additional information and/or corrections have been requested regarding trees, landscaping, and noise.</p>

		<p>Alternatives Options and Recommendations: Recommends building height be increased to achieve tree preservation. Recommends native plants for landscaping.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Alternatives Options and Recommendations: Comments regarding native plants have been provided to the applicant; a revised landscape plan is anticipated at resubmittal. Comments regarding alternative designs or layouts have been provided to the applicant for their information.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
4	Ruth Ethelston	<p>Parking: Has concerns that the proposed parking is insufficient and that the potential impacts to neighboring businesses and properties.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Parking: Development standards, including parking requirements, are established in KMC 18.40. A traffic impact analysis (TIA) was reviewed by the Development Review Engineer. Comments regarding parking have been provided to the applicant; a revised traffic report is anticipated at resubmittal.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 11/7/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
5	Will Grette	<p>Jay's Café: Concerned about the displacement of Jay's Café</p> <p>Funding: Questions on funding and whether the City is funding this project or if Kenmore voters approved this.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Jay's Café: The property sold in 2023. Jay's Café was a willing seller and the property had been on and off the market for years prior to the sale.</p> <p>Funding: This is not a City-funded project. The property is being developed by a private developer (Together We Grow) in partnership with a non-profit (Imagine Housing). Voter approval is not required for private development of this property.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 11/22/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
6	Lauralyn Feetham	<p>Environment and Equity: Opposes removal of exceptional trees; concerned that removing the trees will increase the heat index in the downtown area, which will negatively impact residents, including seniors, children, and people of color.</p> <p>Drainage: Concerned about runoff and drainage.</p>	<p>Environment and Equity: Tree removal limitations, including removal of exceptional trees, are established by the Kenmore Municipal Code (KMC). The proposed development appears to comply with the tree removal requirements established in the KMC however, additional information is required as part of the first review comments. The City is working on a Urban Forestry Management Plan (UFMP) which includes an analysis of tree management and diversity, equity, inclusion, and accessibility (DEIA). For more information on the UFMP contact Nina Rasmussen at nrasmussen@kenmorewa.gov.</p>

		<p>Gas-powered blowers: Requests a condition banning use of gas-operated blowers.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Drainage: Drainage is being reviewed for compliance with the King County Surface Water Design Manual (KCSWDM), as adopted and amended by the KMC. Our Senior Development Review Engineer, Doug van Gelder, P.E., is reviewing the project for compliance.</p> <p>Gas-powered blowers: A ban on gas-powered blowers and other equipment for construction or maintenance is beyond the scope of this project. You can provide this information to our Climate Action Plan Manager, Nina Rasmussen at nrasmussen@kenmorewa.gov or as a public comment to Kenmore City Council by emailing the City Clerk at awarhol@kenmorewa.gov.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
7	Mariana Lasalle	<p>Trees: Concerned that replacement trees are not native and will reduce the ecological value; specifically Crimson Sentry Maple (<i>Acer platanoides</i>).</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Trees: Development standards, including landscaping requirements, are established in KMC 18.35. Comments regarding native plants have been provided to the applicant; a revised landscape plan is anticipated at resubmittal. More specifically, the planner has required the applicant to remove <i>Acer platanoides</i> as a replacement tree, and to incorporate a greater proportion of native plants (both trees and shrubs) into their landscape plans.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
8	Tracy Banaszynski	<p>Trees and the Environment: Opposes removal of exceptional trees. Also, concerned that no replacement trees are native species. Concerned about temperature, air quality, and bird habitat.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>Trees and the Environment: Tree removal limitations, including removal of exceptional trees, are established by the Kenmore Municipal Code (KMC). The proposed development appears to comply with the tree removal requirements established in the KMC however, additional information is required as part of the first review comments. Additional information and/or corrections have been requested regarding trees, air quality, and bird habitat. Comments on the SEPA Environmental Checklist have been provided to the applicant; a revised checklist is anticipated at resubmittal.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City's response can be viewed here.</p>
9	Stacey Valenzuela	<p>Environment and Wildlife: Requests research of the Heron Rookery and Swamp Creek prior to disturbance of the Park</p>	<p>Environment and Wildlife: The Larus project is located approximately 700 feet from the heron rookery (which is adjacent to the Kenmore park-and-ride) and outside the 656-square foot buffer</p>

		<p>& Ride site. Concerned that clearing will endanger heron, eagles, and other wildlife.</p> <p>Affordable Housing: Concerns that the project does not include extremely low-income affordable housing at 30% AMI and asks why only 10 units of 40% AMI units are proposed.</p> <p>Trees and Access: Supports Jim Howard’s revised road location to save trees.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>around the rookery. The project is not associated with the heron rookery. The property is not located within the Swamp Creek buffer or the Swamp Creek Wetland buffer. There are no other mapped critical areas on the property.</p> <p>Affordable Housing: Development standards, including affordability requirements, are established in the underlying zones – Urban Corridor zone, East Subarea, and Urban Residential zone. Per KMC 18.77.030 and .042, for multifamily or mixed-use development in the UC zone, east subarea and UR zone, twenty-five percent (25%) of units must be very low-income affordable housing units if renter-occupied. A “very low-income affordable housing unit” is affordable at or below 50 percent of median income. The project is providing 123 out of 174 units (approximately 70%) at or below 50% AMI. 10 of these units are designed to be affordable at or below 40% AMI). As proposed, the affordable housing provided complies with City code, and significantly exceeds our requirements for affordable housing, since every single unit is priced below market rates.</p> <p>Water Quality and Drainage: To ensure the criteria in WAC 173-201A (Water Quality Standards for Surface Waters of the State of Washington) and RCW 90.71 (Puget Sound Water Quality Protection), the City adopted the 2021 King County Surface Water Design Manual (KCSWDM), which contains standards for maintaining water quality and preventing the degradation of surface waters throughout the City. The City’s Development Review Engineer, Doug Van Gelder (dvangelder@kenmorewa.gov), is reviewing the project for compliance with KCSWDM.</p> <p>Trees and Access: The future access roadway is a requirement of the Comprehensive Plan (Figure T-23). The proposed development appears to comply with the tree removal requirements established in the KMC however, additional information is required as part of the first review comments.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City’s response can be viewed here.</p>
10	Nancy Hansen	<p>Affordable Housing: Concerned that the project does not provide enough very-low income housing below 50% AMI.</p> <p>Design Creativity: Supports Jim Howard’s alternative design for the project.</p>	<p>Affordable Housing: Development standards, including affordability requirements, are established in the underlying zones – Urban Corridor zone, East Subarea, and Urban Residential zone. Per KMC 18.77.030 and .042, for multifamily or mixed-use development in the UC zone, east subarea and UR zone, twenty-five percent (25%) of units must be very low-income affordable housing units if renter-occupied. A “very low-income affordable housing unit” is affordable at or</p>

		<p>Trees and the Environment: Has questions regarding arborist report; how tree health was determined, and if there will be a major loss of canopy. Has concerns about the landscape plans and whether or not the landscaping will be best for (and beneficial to) the pacific northwest environment. Requests native replacement trees.</p> <p>Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>below 50 percent of median income. The project is providing 123 out of 174 units (approximately 70%) at or below 50% AMI. 10 of these units are designed to be affordable at or below 40% AMI). As proposed, the affordable housing provided complies with City code, and significantly exceeds our requirements for affordable housing, since every single unit is priced below market rates.</p> <p>Design Creativity: An alternative road design was submitted by Jim Hanson, not an alternative site or building design. Mr. Hanson’s comments will be reviewed by the city and applicant, consistent with the public comment process.</p> <p>Trees and the Environment: The arborist report includes a methodology section (page 2), however, as part of the first review comments, the city requested that this section be expanded. The revised arborist report should provide more information about how tree health ratings were determined. The City’s tree management and protection code (KMC 18.57) uses a tree density calculation to determine the “value” of certain trees. Existing trees are weighted more heavily than replacement trees in this calculation, which is intended to promote tree retention. The tree code doesn’t explicitly require that replacement trees “provide the same benefits as originals,” but tries to approximate this through the tree density calculation.</p> <p>Comments received were reviewed by City staff and forwarded to the applicant. A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City’s response can be viewed here.</p>
11	Kim Fairbanks	<p>No comments on the project, simply requested to be added as a party of interest. Comments from this party of interest can be viewed in their entirety here.</p>	<p>A written response was provided by the City to the party of interest on 12/13/2024. The City’s response can be viewed here.</p>