

City of Kenmore  
Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes  
September 2, 2025 @ 7:00 PM

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

Tracy Banaszynski, Chair

Kara Macias

Chris Olson

David Dorrian

Edouard Lasalle

Mike Vanderlinde

Absent

Dwight Thompson, Vice Chair

Staff

Todd Hall, Principal Planner

Shannon Tipple-Leen, Planning Commission Clerk

Michelle Kang, Co-Clerk

Consultants with Beckwith Consulting

Julie Blasek

Missi Smith (virtual)

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Lasalle and Vanderlinde were 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 August 26, 2025, were approved. The consent agenda was accepted with unanimous consent.

## 7. AGENDA ITEMS

Todd Hall brought more updates to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan. In addition, Julie Blasek and Missi Smith from Beckwith Consulting were in attendance.

Questions/Comments:

### Goal 1

Commissioner Olson - Adding or modify policy to make clearer on restoration and preservation of waterfront. Desire to have a waterwalk but also not to put that above the preservation of shoreline for natural preservation. (i.e. P-1.1.4 - maybe for those properties that are undeveloped or underdeveloped, maybe we don't want to develop them, keep for natural purposes and enhance), consider alternates.

Commissioner Dorrian - P.1.1.5, mitigate this policy to say that not all that we're doing when key properties become available is looking for public access, consider rewording; for P-1.1.2, possibly change the wording that it's ongoing ("identity and prioritize")?

Commissioner Olson - P-1.1.2, missing "barriers" or another descriptor word.

Chair Banaszynski - Missing some historical context for this section (Water Walk), what was the previous discussion regarding the water walk?

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Follow-up history - did discuss in previous pros plan, there was an opportunity to connect the parks with paths but stumbled because there was private property and comment from Dept of Ecology.

Commissioner Macias - Re: P-1.1.2, still room for providing overarching idea of water walk but be cautious to be prioritizing specific parcels.

Staff response - It's still important to identify at a high-level so that the concepts are identified for long-term planning/funding.

Commissioner Dorrian - These goals come from higher level goals. If we just look at them are they still our goals? If we are talking about pocket parks they don't seem to fit in this.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Water walk, this is clearly aspirational goal, only achieve over time, some kind of map that identifies new trails, potential locations, while at same time identify where the gaps are (i.e., development of Lakepointe as it's being described, opportunities, needs to be identified).

Commissioner Lasalle - Is the water walk the number one priority and if so we should be talking about it. What are the imminent needs. We need to be asking what those are and the rank.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Regarding priorities, need to take into account economic impact of development (i.e. Lakepointe/water walk economic benefit to the city).

Chair Banaszynski - Still want to dig more into the idea of the water walk. It seems that there were a lot of ideas around it before. Though we have not created a ww we have greatly increased access to the water. We know we're under resourced for indoor spaces and arts & culture; thinking about it more broadly, how can built infrastructure interact with natural environment, can we incorporate shared streets into ideas about connectivity (i.e., 181st shared streets), economic development could be better integrated into thinking about connectivity and businesses more broadly than just the water.

Commissioner Olson - More like a waterfront tour, not necessarily accessing the water but helping you connect where you might access the water from; maybe a loop system with higher-impact trails, key parcels or areas (i.e., Lakepointe), improve waterfront connectivity; also consider a policy for connecting Rhody Park, and more north-south connections other than just Juanita Way, a lot of challenges crossing the river, but providing another pedestrian connection across river; are these in order of priority? Consider reordering.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Distinction of what we're calling connectivity and the idea of opening up nature areas and access to parks; in past, discussion at that time what was heavily on economic development and what's going to happen to downtown, lack of north-south connections, and how to link waterfront

to downtown which is major economic benefit; should now interconnect PROS plan and economic development benefits.

Commissioner Macias - At top of goals and policies are framework, think there's value in keeping these goals, not categorized just overall goals, look at the goals of each policy and what it's trying to achieve.

Staff response- when we did comp plan, many of the goals and policies weren't prioritized or emphasized over one another, but now interlinking some of the other comp plan elements goals and policies with the PROS plan policies; also ensuring that PROS Plan and Element policies are same so they're not conflicting with one another and we're consistent; also previous work such as ULI report (green loop).

Chair Banaszynski - Agree with providing broader goals and objectives not changing, but also thinking about how to specifically meet them. Regarding ULI Green Loop, integrate those ideas from report and other elements.

Commissioner Dorrian - In the last PROS plan, the description of goals was not shared (at the top), this is somewhat of a preference of Kenmore, but we should be open to shifting goals from time to time.

Commissioner Olson – We heard in Love Where You Live feedback that waterfront access is priority; would almost prefer water walk be a policy and then have that objective be "coordinate with transportation or economic development element to connect or provide waterfront access," question on balance of waterfront access vs natural space

## Goal 2

Commissioner Dorrian - Some policies feel a bit more point in time vs something ongoing, shift the wording so they're not one-time projects but ongoing policies.

Commissioner Macias - Policy 2.1.2, would like to see language regarding trailhead access or parking for trail head access.

Chair Banaszynski - 2.1.4, would like to think more about north/south but not along Swamp Creek. Think about other areas that are more developed, reuse that space. (i.e., what if we made 68th one way and 73rd one way for vehicles and other half is safe, pedestrian oriented), could consider repurposing existing asphalt areas

Commissioner Lasalle - Second this comment, if we are going to remove or reword, it would be this one (2.1.4)

Commissioner Olson - Less of a north/south issue as there is an east/west gap, a lot harder getting across 80th over to downtown, suggest rewording 2.1.4 to "Identify and develop plans to connect east/west connectivity and route directedness to parks", more impactful trails that are for transportation purposes.

Chair Banaszynski - We need to start think about how to protect the creek and the wetland from infrastructure vs protecting infrastructure from creek and wetlands.

Chair Banaszynski - 2.1.4, also agree with east/west connectivity.

Commissioner Olson - Properties along backside of 522 is adjacent to wetlands and have some flooding issues, one option is providing connection along the backside as these properties are redeveloped, or along 192nd St.

### Goal 3

Commissioner Macias - 3.2.2 - costs in annual budgeting; also, how do we categorize and prioritize those projects.

Commissioner Lasalle - Could improve wording of Goal 3, isn't reflected or consistent in the policies.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Maintaining assets, talking about financial ability, address in last goal, how can we enhance this.

Commissioner Dorrian - Example of goal added over time; 3.1.5, starts with a verb. Can we have a master plan that isn't about a specific area?  
Staff response – yes I think so.

Commissioner Olson - For goal 3, objective seems to be missing, also regarding 3.1.5, maybe rewording to "develop a master plan for habitat and habitat corridor restoration and opportunity for public access."

Commissioner Dorrian - Add missing Objective 3.1 from last PROS Plan - "Protect environmentally sensitive critical areas in parks and open spaces and provide opportunities for habitat restoration, enhancement and public access."

Commissioner Macias - 3.1.3, do we want to insert language to create a balance

with emphasis on habitat restoration, that this is our first priority, instead of public access at the end.

Commissioner Olson - Maybe add an objective on built environment vs. sustainability, heavily focused on sustainability but should have more on buildings and recreational uses.

Commissioner Dorrian - Should think about policies that talk about built parks environment.

#### Goal 4

Commissioner Lasalle - Good objective, but policies all over the place, many are non-specific or already completed, or dealing in specifics that we need to understand the unmet needs.

Commissioner Olson - This might be a better spot to shift some policies from 3.2 and maybe make goal 3 more natural environment; another objective? Built environments for community to enjoy, meeting recreational needs by our built environment.

Commissioner Macias - Although goal is to create a balance of passive and active recreation; likes policies 4.1.7 - 10, but the previous ones feel disjointed.

Commissioner Dorrian - Would advocate of splitting Objective P-4.1 (maintaining and enhancing existing parks, and acquire new land for new parks).

Chair Banaszynski - Agree that some of the policies could be removed because already implemented; also consider that master plans do need a refresh because community values and desires changes (i.e. Twin Springs, Wallace both need updates); not sure we can always provide a balance between passive and active, be sensitive of what the land is telling us in what is an appropriate human activity (i.e. Wallace, hard to have balance with natural and developed as it's entirely within wetland or riparian area).

Commissioner Olson - Look at objective and maybe the built environment of previous objective, "consider master plan reevaluation every 10 years" two objectives, 1 parks and 1 more focused on quality of potential parks or identifying gaps in recreational and open spaces that we'd like to fill or address.

Goal 5

Commissioner Olson - Some places City Hall, hangar, etc., are easier to help promote art vs. having outdoor art.

Commissioner Dorrian - Policy 5.1.3, we only want to promote only facilities within city that are only private and not public? Don't know if we're addressing multicultural, recreational center.

Consultant response - Not quite there yet, 5.1.6 maybe the closest, but should stay very general, but identifying the need and synergies inherent in combining groups together could be reflected in policies.

Chair Banaszynski - Do we have a 1% for art policy?

Staff response - That's how art was purchased for Log Boom and TL Park.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Do think 1% is a requirement.

Commissioner Macias - Does objective 5.1 not really make sense? Like Shoreline's plan about improving access to public art and cultural services

Consultant response - looked up different place of sale of public art, not as popular as doing regular public art that stays, eliminates grant opportunities when public for sale, some artists that do public wouldn't be eligible for that type of funding, selling vs. installations of public art around town

Consultant (Julie) - Wenatchee, started to divest due to maintenance reasons, having an arts plan is good so you don't end up with things you don't want to accept, 1% is interesting, can blend art and architecture, like bridges, can help with tourism, attraction that is functional and attractive.

Consultant (Missi) - If you're ever interested in creating arts district thru Arts Washington, just a distinction that's geographic but also economic, but requires commission that oversees (arts council), some grants and wayfinding grant and placemaking grant.

Commissioner Olson - Could have art in public spaces but also support arts in the community; there's a potential to not necessarily have a choice on what type of art is displayed?

Consultant response - Usually good policies for selecting artwork, but sometimes municipalities see that if art is donated and you don't have a good policy on what is accepted and a place for them it's not bringing the value you want in your arts program policies.

Commissioner Olson - Low-cost way to City to direct money to the arts.  
Consultant response - wouldn't discourage about displaying public art but having to recirculate it has been shown to be problematic in some jurisdictions.  
Staff response - discussed gateway art ideas for key intersections or areas

Commissioner Dorrian - Not seeing much in public art in policies ; p-5.1.4, might be better placed in under another goal.

Commissioner Olson - A lot of policies that don't necessarily align with objective, need one on public art and another on maintenance and sustainability of public art programs.

Chair Banaszynski - Maybe in Economic Development element, how we use public art as sense of place, and create connectivity, maybe an arts organization would want to take selling art as project, we have wonderful arts and culture organizations, we're lacking in space for them.

Commissioner Olson - Something around siting or identifying location for a theater or cultural center.

Commissioner Macias - Pursue options or continues to pursue options for cultural center.

Goal 5, aquatic access similarly to Shoreline is inequitable with the only access also through private organizations. As noted in Shoreline PROS plan "Research shows that youth of color die by drowning at much higher rates than their white counterparts, making the need for publicly accessible swim lessons a vital component to addressing racial inequities in Shoreline". Would like to include a goal "Pursue opportunities to equitable access to all residents with access to an aquatic facility.

### Goal 6

Chair Banaszynski - Goals and policies, all of them, could use a good sort and review.

Commissioner Lasalle - Goal 6, multiple policies on acquire land, funding, refreshing various elements, etc.; more summarized level.

Chair Banaszynski - As being sorted, could catch some redundancies.

Commissioner Olson - Recommended timeline for review of master plans when necessary (5-6 years?).

Consultant response - Might be a good location for arts, policies, or programs.

### Goal 7

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Goal is very restrictive goal, many of policies and objectives are repetitive, more specific elsewhere.

Proposed goal "Identify and implement a stable and durable revenue source for acquisition and maintenance of the City's parks, recreations, and open space assets."

Proposed Objective - "Identify City and agency partnerships for joint development and maintenance of parks, recreation, and open space assets"

Staff go through and review repetitive objectives and policies (i.e., 1.13, 1.2.5, 3.16, 3.22)

Commissioner Macias - 7.1.1 - should we include "required and ongoing site mitigation" into this policy. There are maintenance costs for every park, but we also have required mitigation in some parks and potentially future areas.

7.2.2 - I'd like to see this verbiage as, "Work cooperatively with local jurisdictions to pursue opportunities to provide access to aquatic and recreation facilities to meet community need and equitable access".

Objective P-7.2- I would like to add "pursue" after Encourage.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - 7.1.1 and .2 redundant, 7.1.3 - delete "prior to making commitments....."

7.1.6 - all of the costs recovered through impact fees? Is that what we intended? Also, sustainable and durable revenue source.....that's a metropolitan parks district (MPD), which provides both for acquisition and ongoing maintenance

Chair Banaszynski - Could be a policy explore or evaluate establishment of a Metropolitan Park District.

Commissioner Olson - 7.2.1, transportation, partner, linear parks, 181st as our main street, what it looks like and partnerships.

Commissioner Lasalle - 7.2.9 should this be removed?

Staff response - Discuss with Debbie if this should be kept or not.

Commissioner Macias - Chapter 7, there is a task that talks about an Metropolitan Park District.

Chair Banaszynski - Regarding maintenance, should in capital improvement program, don't have resources to maintain our resources the way community or staff expects, what policy to suggest.

Commissioner Olson - Maybe combine 7.1.1 and .2 and adjust language for durable and sustainable revenue source, also language on volunteering and other forms of city engagement toward maintenance for public parks, maybe broaden policy 7.1.8 to incorporate this idea.

Staff response - Leverage all of our resources including staff and volunteer groups to keep up on maintenance.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Challenges is that Kenmore residents aren't the only users, a lot of outside users, how do we address this? partnerships, agreements with other cities, would we want to add as this as an objective? EcoDev is another way through taxes.

Commissioner Olson - EcoDev opportunities, community involvement/maintenance, coordination with EcoDev element, business development near parks and other facilities

Chair Banaszynski - Good to have a policy on volunteers and stewardship, a lot of work to manage volunteers, leveraging volunteer and other groups that will work with the city to help

Commissioner Macias - Is there anywhere to discuss senior center, pursue options of new site or rebuilding

MV - other places that we want to look for in other jurisdictions for facilities, but who is in charge of this, do we need to have this reflected in goals and policies

Commissioner Macias - Wording like "explore" or "pursue"

Staff response - Tom mentioned to consider multi-use facility vs. single-use facility

Commissioner Olson - 7.2.7 and 8, rewording regarding volunteering

Julie shared graphic for parking garage, cultural center, senior center, for city-owned post office site. Rhody has competing uses and park and placing in a location such as downtown might work better

Chair Banaszynski - PROS separate of narrative and goals and policies are separate. Need to bring those two brings together. Need the metrics, drivers and priorities

Commissioner Dorrian - Would like to know how seniors get to current senior center; relocating post office?

Consultant response- Accessibility from around and within the senior center is currently inadequate, but would be addressed for proper location.

Next Steps:

9/16 meeting: Additional Discussion (PROS Plan/PROS Element/Maps)

9/23 meeting: Additional Discussion (Final Comments on All Drafts)

10/7: Public Hearing/Make Recommendation for Oct. 7 City Council Meeting

10/20: Recommendation to City Council

## 8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Banaszynski adjourned the meeting at 9:36PM.

*Shannon Tipple-Leen*

---

Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: 9/16/2025