City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting
September 3, 2019 @ 7:00 p.m.

Planning Commission Members – In Attendance

Mark Ohrenschall, Chair
Carol Baker
Nathan Loutsis
Mike Mulcare
Dennis Olson
Mike Vanderlinde

Consultants & Staff

Maureen Colaizzi, Parks Project Manager
Debbie Bent, Community Development Director
Maura Query, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ohrenschall at 7:00 p.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

There were no citizen comments at this meeting.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve at this meeting.

4. AGENDA ITEMS

The draft recommendations for the PROS plan were reviewed. This meeting was an opportunity for the Planning Commissioners to ask questions and provide feedback on the materials. The next steps will be to draft the recommendations in one document and provide it back to the Planning Commission.

Maureen Colaizzi presented the PROS plan draft to the Planning Commission. The 5 basic recommendations in Attachment 1 were reviewed and described. These were: 1) Improve access to parks, recreation, and open space facilities 2) Access to waterfront 3) Support active and healthy lifestyles 4) Conservation of the built and natural environment 5) Provide for a diverse range of parks, recreation and open space interests and ensure flexibility in the system to respond to changing interests over time

Attachment 3 was explained. The attachment was color coded. White rows indicated accomplished items. Grey are in progress. Blue are in the 2015 CFP but have not been started and are recommended to be in the new CFP. Yellow are new projects. City staff drafted a recommendation on priority. These recommendations show what can be done first in a short term (6 year) period. Short term projects were listed on page 20 of attachment 1. Two new projects are recommended for short term consideration: 1) Creating a master plan for Linwood Park. 2) A north-south trail utilizing swamp creek corridor. Attachment 3 also listed mid-term (7-13 years) projects and long-term (14-20+ years) projects. The items on attachment 3 that do not have a cost shown are new projects that need to have funding worked out. This list was created without constraints of considering funded projects only.

Attachment 4 was reviewed. It shows the value of the city's park facilities and speaks to the cost it takes to maintain the park system for the city's current population. There is a proposed level of service to maintain where the city is currently at for the future population. There are benchmarks for how to reach this level of service that help asses how the city is doing in providing parks and recreation for the community.

Attachment 5 showed a potential schedule for moving the PROS plan along. The schedule included opportunities for community engagement.

A 3-question survey was developed as a follow up to the statistically valid survey. It was available to anyone in the community. It allowed the city to determine if the community has new or different feedback now, or if it confirmed what was learned in the statistically valid survey. There was an open house scheduled for September 25th to allow to provide basic information regarding the goals and policies of the PROS plan and an opportunity for engagement from the community.

A clarifying question was asked regarding the proposed change worksheet's inclusion of park maintenance and dollar amounts. This worksheet only looked at major replacements or repairs, like a new roof to a building, and did not include daily maintenance. Dollar amounts cannot be assigned until after analysis and assessments regarding where the city's existing facilities are at in their life cycle. These dollar amounts, when assigned, will include estimated maintenance costs at the time of project creation.

There was a brief discussion regarding why some projects were considered long or mid-term. Project priority could change but only if there is funding to make it happen.

A question was asked regarding balancing passive vs active use with regards t the short-term projects. The city is trying hard to balance that. Water front access provides a lot of activities and working around natural landscapes has to be a consideration. It was recommended that clear communication be made regarding this at the open house.

The needs analysis was discussed. Conversations regarding the reality of land available for acquisitions were had.

There was a concern raised about any parks at risk of being maintained as a city use. Bastyr is not city owned so would be the only one to worry about. Moorlands was brought up as a shared use between the school and public, however it is city owned property, so it is not at risk.

Saint Edwards was discussed. A question was asked regarding what the plan would be if it is not approved. The city could partner with the school district on improving current school fields, but that would not address the capacity needs of the field. Acquiring more land would be another option, though perhaps unrealistic to find 4+ acres of land that could be used as a ball field.

Additional conversations were had regarding hearing a need from the community for an aquatic center or pop-up dog park. An aquatic center is not something that could happen in the short term, the city would need partners to help fund this. There does not seem to be enough interest to pursue pool options at this time. A pop-up dog park requires resources, planning, and the right location.

At the first meeting in November the city plans to come back with the draft recommendations that incorporates survey/community feedback.

A panel is being put together on Affordable Housing. A date was still being determined but would be provided once set.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ohrenschall adjourned the meeting at 8:24 p.m.

Mark Ohrenschall

Planning Commission
Approved by Planning Commission on: Feb. 4, 2020