City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Meeting
November 5, 2019 @ 7:00 p.m.

Planning Commission Members – In Attendance

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

Consultants & Staff

Lauri Anderson, Principal Planner
Juliet Vong, Landscape Architect, HBB Landscape Architecture
Maura Query, Administrative Assistant

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Chair Ohrenschall at 7:01 p.m.

2. CITIZEN COMMENTS

Bethany Virgillo, Kenmore WA, spoke about how trails in Kenmore are important. She mentioned that the hills in the area, particularly around Inglemoor High School, make it difficult for kids to walk to school. She stated that a trail to the high school would be nice.

Ethan Fisher, Kenmore WA, asked for information about what the Planning Commission does. Chair Ohrenschall provided an explanation regarding how the Planning Commission is formed, what is done in the meetings, and the role of the commission in the city.

Tracy Banaszynski, Kenmore WA, spoke about salmon recovery. She stated that restoring the salmon habitat is essential. She commented that the PROS plan did include mention of natural spaces and environmental stewardship but would like to see something specific to salmon habitats included.

Timothy Virgillo, Kenmore WA, spoke about concerns for the symbiotic nature parks must have with humans. He commented that he is looking for the big picture to come together for the people who live in Kenmore, and requested a consideration for how things can grow in the community.

Katie Barr, Kenmore WA, spoke about the increased number of panhandlers in Kenmore and asked if there were plans for how this would be handled. She

commented that there has been an increase in trash and that for a teen girl it can be uncomfortable when some panhandlers become aggressive. She suggested signs stating 'no panhandling' or increasing public awareness might be some ideas for how to address this issue.

Phyllis Finley, Kenmore WA, requested that the City pay close attention to the statistically valid survey completed in Kenmore, and that it be the Planning Commission's guiding light for the PROS plan. She requested that the comments from the open house be made public.

Xander Jones, Bothell WA, spoke about affordable housing in the area and asked if the Planning Commission is trying to figure out low income housing.

Karen Prince, Kenmore WA, spoke about open spaces in parks. She asked that the city please keep them open. She commented on how open spaces are being lost and she isn't seeing as many birds in the area. She also spoke of including exercise equipment for all ages in parks. She also mentioned that Saint Edwards is something so precious and should be kept natural.

3. APPROVAL OF MINUTES

There were no minutes to approve

4. AGENDA ITEMS

City Staff spoke to the request for the comments from the open house. These comments are being typed and included as an appendix in the full PROS plan. There are also plans for determining the feasibility of connecting parks to schools.

The purpose of the meeting was to review the consolidated PROS plan and highlight what is different or changed from the previous document provided. More language pertaining to partnering for programming was added. Proposals for acquisitions were moved to the mid-term timeline. The horizon year was changed from 2025 to 2040.

Comments and questions were made by section.

The demographics used as the basis of the PROS plan were expanded in the introduction. The population projection for 2040 was based on a straight line out from the Puget Sound population projection for 2035. Questions and concerns were raised regarding this approach. It was felt that a lot is built on the population projection, so the accuracy of the projection is important.

A decision to consider Rhododendron Park a Community Park was made, even though there may be regional draw because of the boathouse. Jack Crawford Skate

Park was changed from a Neighborhood to a Community park. A comment was made that as years go by, the parks may no longer fit into these same categories as they do now.

It was asked if the PROS plan takes parks in bordering jurisdictions into consideration. Parks in bordering jurisdictions were included when considering the Walk Analysis.

The PROS plan was updated to clarify the status of recreation programming partnerships.

The Natural Resources section includes information about protecting natural resources but defers in some part to the Comprehensive Plan Natural Environment Sub-Element.

The Demand and Need Analysis section was reviewed. Questions arose regarding definitions of terms, for example, 'environmentally sustainable'. There was a desire for everyone reading the PROS plan to have the same definition for context. It was suggested by City staff to include a section in the plan that provides the thoughts behind the terminology.

The Community Interests section includes information based on the comments and results from the statistically valid survey as well as the PROS Plan open house. This section is high level, and details are to be included in an appendix.

Population growth projection was discussed again. The document will be updated to define how the number was determined.

The Geographic Distribution section has been updated to include upcoming projects in the analysis.

There was a change to the participation rates. The data on participation rates had been based on previous years; this has been updated with more current data. It doesn't change the overall need but gives more context.

The recommendations were reviewed. There was a brief conversation about the Moorlands neighborhood trail connection. City staff was looking for feedback from the Planning Commissioners on whether an off-road connection through wooded areas should be pursued, or if the connection should be handled through sidewalks planned under Walkways and Waterways. The decision was to leave the connection in the PROS plan and that it could be either an off-road or 'on' road connection.

Programming support was added as a new project. It was noted that funding would be a partnership.

Next steps were to take the feedback from this meeting and put together the appendices. The full document would be brought back to the Planning Commission for review.

November 19th would be the public hearing on ADU regulations.

December 3rd would be when the final version of the PROS Plan is presented.

5. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Ohrenschall adjourned the meeting at 8:41 p.m.

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