

City of Kenmore  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
November 20, 2025 @ 7:00 PM

Planning Commission Members – In Attendance (the meeting was held onsite and virtually using the Zoom online platform)

Tracy Banaszynski, Chair (Virtual)

Dwight Thompson, Vice Chair (Acting as Chair)

Kara Macias

Edouard Lassalle

Mike Vanderlinde

David Dorrian

Excused

Chris Olson

Staff

Debbie Bent, Community Development Director

Todd Hall, Principal Planner

Shannon Tipple-Leen, Planning Commission Clerk

Michelle Kang, Co-Clerk

Consultants with Beckwith Consulting

Tom Beckwith

1. CALL TO ORDER

The meeting was called to order by Vice Chair Thompson at 7:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioner Olson was excused from the meeting.

3. LAND ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

The Land Acknowledgement was read.

4. FLAG SALUTE

The Flag Salute was done.

5. PUBLIC COMMENTS

No Public comment was given.

6. CONSENT AGENDA - APPROVAL OF MINUTES

The Planning Commission Meeting Minutes from October 7, 2025, were approved. The consent agenda was accepted with unanimous consent.

7. AGENDA ITEMS

PROS Plan review

Tom Beckwith presented the updates to the PROS Plan.

Questions/Comments:

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Built in 2.9 percent inflation. We know there will be additional costs based on population growth.

Beckwith response: We presume that you will need to have repair and replacement increase but you could include a higher growth rate for maintenance.

Commissioner Lassalle – Appreciate the detail numbers. I do not see how we can talk about these numbers without having talked about our vision for parks in Kenmore. Should all parks have the same facilities or should they differ. What is the gap analysis between what have and what need to have, without this then it is not possible to talk about cost and how it is funded. Missing what the parks should do and why. When we went through each park and the potential for each park, the master plans were illustrative and what the parks should have has not been discussed. No discussion about why improvements need to be there in the first place.

Beckwith response: High-level city-wide analysis based on vision, then looked at each park and correlate with city wide. It's in the document.

Commissioner Lassalle – (Shared slide presentation that was shown to City Council on October 27). What Kenmore wants, resident surveys and City Council vision. That exists. What Kenmore has, that exists. What is missing is what Kenmore should have. Not tied to surrounding area. Recommendations should be data driven based on what's missing.

Beckwith response: Benchmarks quantitative, surveys qualitative.

Commissioner Lassalle – Still does not address what are the unmet needs.

Commissioner Dorrian - Financials based on maintaining existing ratios, but if only budget for current ratios and not change in level of service.

Beckwith response: Land rich and facility poor and Capital Facilities Projects (CFP) reflects what is missing. Growth Management Act (GMA) asks, 'can you pay for it?' Worksheets show how can pay for it, how it's feasible. Only need to show which tools we're using for GMA.

Commissioner Dorrian - Confusing that capital and operating expenditures combined. Land acquisition is a capital expenditure but can't use bonds for operating.

Beckwith response: Looking at totals, and what do we need to come up with? What is left for new things?

Commissioner Dorrian - Looking at CFP. One discussion was about acquiring land for senior center, the CFP does not include acquisition but only for upgrading existing facility.

Beckwith response: Money for acquiring site for community center which could be multi-generational not a new senior center.

Commissioner Dorrian - Thought we had a whole conversation on the Post Office site?

Beckwith response: Could consider that site. Multigenerational center line item considers senior center element to it. Existing senior center would then be general multi-purpose building.

Staff - This plan gives an overall picture of what we could do. This plan isn't a project level plan. It's where you could go and how to get there through various funding options.

Beckwith response: This plan is aspirational, not very specific.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Differentiating between "should" and "would". Change on Appendix F.2 "Proposed Revenue" to "Revenue Options" or "Trends"

Vice Chair Thompson - Use of REET for parks is difficult based on City's use of current REET dollars.

Beckwith response: We need to show if feasible, not an analysis.

Vice Chair Thompson - We're not being asked to prioritize this list, correct?

Staff response: No, this is the information that you'll use in the future to inform. It's a range of possibilities/options. Discussion around terminology, maybe an explanation about what this plan is and isn't. A framework.

Commissioner Lassalle - What we have been reviewing has been integrated, holistic proposition. An a la carte menu what could do, not should do. Gap

analysis is useful but not necessary. Recommendations for finance cover everything. If it is not a recommendation, then how can we frame it as a list of options?

Staff response: Tom has provided a document that has addressed what Recreation and Conservation Office (RCO)/Growth Management Act (GMA) requires. This also ties to the PROS goals and policies. Used to develop a six-year Capital Improvement Plan (CIP).

Chair Banaszynski - Advocate what it is and isn't directly into the document. Add to the intro or add an exec summary.

Beckwith response: Suggests an executive summary.

Commissioner Macias - Looking at whether bond or levy to maintain current LOS, we have to do something, correct?

Beckwith response: Yes

Staff response: The impact fee rate study is part of Tom's scope and is the next step. Will determine the new park impact fee rate.

**MOTION** – Commissioner Dorrian moved to cancel the December 16th Planning Commission meeting. Commissioner Thompson seconded. 6 Yes: 0 No. Motion passed.

Commissioner Dorrian - We need to review implementation section of PROS Plan at the next meeting (December 2). We need to review and consider softening the language.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Survey show challenge for financing especially if new source. So to achieve LOS given increase in population challenging and to meet the aspirational nature of plan.

Commissioner Dorrian - Survey responses on new financing likely would be no but depends on how question asked and what the money will be for.

Commissioner Thompson - Discuss what is the difference to Northshore Parks, Recreation Service Area (NPRSA) or Metropolitan Park District (MPD). Debbie said she'll address that at Council if it is asked.

Commissioner Macias - How many Kenmore residents use Northshore Senior Center?

Staff response: Will need to get information.

Commissioner Macias - Update on Bastyr. Will that be on 2025 docket?

Staff response: No new information.

Next Steps:

Planning Commission Meeting December 2, 7pm

8. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 8:59PM.

*Shannon Tipple-Leen*

\_\_\_\_\_  
Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: 12/2/2025