

City of Kenmore
Planning Commission Special Meeting Minutes
September 23, 2025 @ 7:00 PM

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

Tracy Banaszynski, Chair

Dwight Thompson, Vice Chair

Kara Macias

Edouard Lasalle

Mike Vanderlinde

Chris Olson

Absent

David Dorrian

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 Chair Banaszynski at 7:00 PM.

2. ROLL CALL

Commissioners Dorrian 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 September 16, 2025, were approved. The consent agenda was accepted with unanimous consent.

7. AGENDA ITEMS

Staff brought more updates to the Parks, Recreation and Open Space (PROS) Plan. In addition, Tom Beckwith from Beckwith Consulting was in attendance.

Questions/Comments:

Goals and Policies

Goal 1

Commissioner Lasalle – Add a footnote to explain what WaterWalk refers to.

Goal 2

No comment.

Goal 3

Chair Banaszynski – Felt heard on Policy 3.1.

Goal 4

No comment

Goal 5

Commissioner Lasalle – First nation reference is encouraging. Adding programs about First Nations here as well. Around signage. Not making it the only thing but highlight on park as well.

Staff response – Can add in both places. Expand on Policy P51.4

Goal 6

Commissioner Lasalle - Like 6.1

Goal 7

No comments.

Review of PROS Plan Capital Facilities Plan

Commissioner Vanderlinde – In order to make this real we need to look at Economic Dev, Lakepointe, Bastyr etc. Number of costs related to General Funds which are already running in a deficit.

Beckwith response – These projects will get ranked with surveys etc. There is an appendix to PROS plan looking at what the City can afford in a six and 20 year timeframe.

Vice Chair Thompson – Overpass and underpass cost estimates. Seems too low.

Staff response – This is just for feasibility, not construction.

Beckwith response - Indicated this would be from general fund, but anything along 522 would also come from WSDOT, could be much bigger numbers if working with WSDOT, listed these as General Fund as it's difficult to quote at this stage.

Commissioner Lasalle – What are the purpose of each of these parks? What feedback that you're expecting from the Planning Commission? Is the Commission to decide what is the right amount to fund and were, there hasn't been any discussion as to "why".

Beckwith response - All of these are generated in PROS plan, these are listed in each particular park site or citywide park plan. What we're expecting from PC iis are these the projects you're looking for, are the costs reasonable, and what are your priorities; priorities also from the survey; for how to finance, there will be appendix that will go in much more detail.

Commissioner Lasalle - Seems to be a bottom's up approach. If this echoes what's in the PROS plan, then by default then we've approved it and why are we looking at it. If we haven't talked about what the parks should look like, then how do we approve this? Going from policies immediately to the costs, to where the parks are going and therefore where the costs are.

Beckwith response - PROS contents sequence - 1. Goals and Policies are first, 2. Public Survey 3. Citywide Element. We are going from top down, not bottom up

Commissioner Lasalle - Why are we bypassing all of the middle steps by having the policies, then let's get into costs; sidestepping from high level then to more detailed review.

Beckwith response - At workshops we went through all facilities, graphics.

Commissioner Lasalle - These graphics were aspirational.

Beckwith response - We're responsible for the costs.

Commissioner Lasalle - What is the feedback you're expecting - the costs? Does this inform or expecting specific feedback?

Beckwith response - Does this represent what's in PROS plan, is list complete, and most importantly the priorities.

Chair Banaszynski - Concur with Commissioner Lasalle, don't feel like we've been able to agree/disagree on this list.

Commissioner Macias – Want to make sure we are looking at this like a whole, not just deciding on what bucket of money this is coming from.

Commissioner Olson– This is an unrestrained list. We should add things to it that we maybe don't want so we can address them for grants etc. As far as urban parks or amenities. Is there coordination with developers to do a rooftop park or something like that. Priority piece from the communities is a must. Also, what can we afford?

Beckwith response - This is the current list that is in your current PROS Plan, but it doesn't limit you as long as they are aligned with G&P. On the other hand, you can eliminate things from the list as long as they are eliminated off the PROS Plan as well.

Commissioner Vanderlinde– This is an unrestrained list based on what we have heard in the past. I don't see anything that gives me great angst. This also doesn't need to be adhered to. I am looking forward to hearing from the public about what they want, and I think Council wants that too.

Chair Banaszynski – What do we do with our desire to have more input on the list.

Staff response – We need more time to get public feedback and that might be 1st quarter next year.

Beckwith response – If you are uncomfortable with a line element on the CFP you can take it out. With the full PROS Plan you can put it back in or address then.

Commissioner Lasalle – If everything can be on the list then why is there a list? I see Northshore Summit has a line item for a picnic shelter and sport court and if we find that is true then I am fine, but we don't have the input to know. If everything is on the menu then why restrict and we can put other things on the list.

Beckwith response – We developed a PROS Plan, reviewed parks, at some point need to have a list of project that city will need to fund; 1. Element of comp plan and 2. full stand-alone PROS Plan; two timelines to meet - PROS Element/CFP to RCO by end of year to be eligible for grants and review by Commerce, PROS Plan goes to RCO on separate schedule, that plan will have full list; this is non-binding list - these are all conceptual based on PROS Plan.

Vice Chair Thompson - Agree with Chair, if something shows up on a list it gives the impression it might actually happen. I hear that it can be massaged but I believe there are some items on this list that the majority of the PC are not comfortable with, and it will not injure the document. Vote on a deleting a line and be done with it.

Chair Banaszynski – Talk about each line and say whether or not we believe it should stay. Then when we get the information later things could be added to it.

Commissioner Olson - Some things are added I believe to connect. We don't know what the impact will be without a plan and investigation into how it would happen. It might make the list nebulous but that might be better than cutting too much. Thinking back to the trail that didn't happen on the Tolt.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – If there are some items that haven't been discussed then we move them to a later time to bring back to discuss.

Commissioner Lasalle – Agree with Vice Chair Thompson. If we need to come up a list, then fine but if we have a list that is not prioritized and is none binding than it is fine as is. But if we need a list to reflect our priorities.

Chair Banaszynski – They may be in the PROS Plan but if there are things we have concerns about then we need to discuss. Maybe not line by line but what about mentioning ones we have concerns about.

Commissioner Olson – I have concerns with the tributaries. And Moorlands Park and the synthetic field. The last one was the universal playground.

Staff response – Moorlands is in CFP for drainage. If it is a go then it could only move forward if it was paid for by impact fees. The City Hall Playground is currently in the CFP and is in feasibility study.

Beckwith – Why don't we delete the tributaries if you aren't comfortable?

Commissioner Olson – I would like to discuss more.

Vice Chair Thompson – Environmental concerns on synthetic turf.

Chair Banaszynski – What is little Swamp Creek? Is this another trail area. I would like to have it tabled. 4 nods.

Park development holdovers

Commissioner Olson - Tolt Pipeline Trail - should this go back to the planning phase instead?

Beckwith response - This is a holdover project.

Chair Banaszynski - What are holdovers?

Staff response - Listed in transportation element that follows the road, if no dollar amount and Planning Commission doesn't want it, can take it out.

Park List with amenities

Vice Chair Thompson - Suggest removing PWOC project.

Staff response - could take this out because it's listed elsewhere. Yes, remove.

Vice Chair Thompson - Pocket parks, concerned if we locate these on the list;

Beckwith response - These aren't site specific just general areas.

Vice Chair Thompson - How came up with costs for senior center?

Beckwith response - \$200/sf renovate, \$400/sf new, if to replace somewhere else, will still need to upgrade the building.

Vice Chair Thompson - Fields, no matter where they go this is estimated costs?

Beckwith response - Yes, all-inclusive costs.

Commissioner Olson - Parking improvements included?

Beckwith response - Yes; just change to parking improvements; can we change pocket parks to geographic areas. Yes, would be good idea to be less specific (i.e. Area 1, 2, etc.), can change graphic to be consistent.

Commissioner Lasalle – Though it is a dream list, it is a list with monetary amounts. Have concern how it looks for Council.

Chair Banaszynski– I too have concerns and think some of these come from very old master plans.

Beckwith response – Catch 22, if you go to Council and have detailed specifics like this, then where in your plan is it? If you give them a number, why did you get the number, what's it based on, etc. Have to decide whether to be more abstract or more detailed.

Commissioner Olson - Some items on CFP would we make these numbers more abstract, nearest \$10,000 or add a larger contingency?

Beckwith response – Yes.

Commissioner Olson - Re: synthetic turf, changing language to "field capacity

improvements" so it's not specific.

Beckwith response - Yes, could just say turf and not what type.

KM – with the park sheets be adjusted to find what we learned.

Beck – they need to be consistent

KM – Senior Center costs. Can we add to that because we have that as a priority.

Beck – budget was based on 200 sq foot. A lot was based on what the remodeling needs are. One thing we did do was not tear it down.

DT – Suggesting a subcommittee to go through the park amenities list.

Staff – not clear on subcommittees purpose

TB – like the idea but lets table until the end.

Question about Wallace and where did some of these ideas come from. Agree with Comm Olson about the parking. Would like to strike the parking from this. Two nods.

CO – I can strike parking but not the cost estimate. On that some line would we want to add parking to the trails.

Beck – It is in the trails.

TB -

EL – The exact dollar amounts seem very specific

Beck – the numbers are taken from the plan

TB – I have had concerns about the amount of trails through Swamp Creek.

CO – Need a bit more flexibility in cost.

MV – Sounds like we have some Commissioner who are uncomfortable with trails especially with Swamp Creek. Do we want to take them out?

KM – Is there a way to pull up the draft plan of the trails.

CO – like the idea of a disclaimer so that's its clear these are planning level and not design.

KM – worry is that we won't get to the nitty gritty until it gets approved to move to the CIP plan.

LOS

TB - P19 – Talked about switching the language from Master Plan to something else. I don't like pulling up very old MP

P23 – Camp Roots should be Harvard Beecher Programs

KM – House burdened areas. We have Census tracts in the LWYL program that will help. 2 likes of the idea.

Next Steps:

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

10/20: Recommendation to City Council

8. ADJOURNMENT

Chair Banaszynski adjourned the meeting at 8:28PM.

Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: _____