

City of Kenmore  
Planning Commission Meeting Minutes  
December 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

Dwight Thompson, Vice Chair

Kara Macias

Edouard Lassalle

Mike Vanderlinde

David Dorrian

Chris Olson

Staff

Debbie Bent, Community Development Director

Todd Hall, Principal Planner

Shannon Tipple-Leen, Planning Commission Clerk

Michelle Kang, Co-Clerk

Tom Beckwith with Beckwith Consulting

1. CALL TO ORDER

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

2. ROLL CALL

All commissioners present.

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 November 20, 2025, were approved. The consent agenda was accepted with unanimous consent.

## 7. AGENDA ITEMS

Review of Implementation Section of PROS Plan

Questions/Comments:

Chair Banaszynski – Changing “will” to “may” in first sentence.

### **Task 5**

Vice Chair Thompson – Levies are still maxed out by State law correct? When we initiate the levy we are in a position that we cannot exceed that value? In order to increase we would have to have a vote.

Beckwith response: Yes and Metropolitan Park District has a maximum but can put out project-oriented levy if voters approve. Max a city can charge, but also max charge all taxing jurisdictions combined can charge.

Vice Chair Thompson – Do we know how close we are to our maximum?

Beckwith response: It's in the budget.

### **Task 10**

Beckwith: For Action, should probably say "Consider developing a Recreation Center, and/or a Cultural Center, and/or an Aquatic Center."

Chair Banaszynski – Reword beginning sentence to read "City Council will maintain the Hangar Building and Kenmore Senior Center, and may develop Recreation Center....."

### **Task 11**

Commissioner Vanderlinde – I like will over may “Kenmore will develop..” and a time period.

Commissioner Macias - Is there a standard review time?

Beckwith response: 3 year.

Staff response: More flexible rather than prescriptive.

Beckwith response: Could use "should" for a time period.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – Suggests "Kenmore will develop a process to assess and review actions on the projects and programs identified above every 3 years."

Commissioner Thompson– When I read participants list it is missing the public. The progress assessment feedback "shall" include the public.

Commissioner Dorrian – Reads like updating the PROS Plan and we will only do that 6 times a year. We should do it more than that.  
Beckwith response: Usually when you're doing project assessments, you look at all the other tasks. How are we progressing.

Commissioner Dorrian - Want to maintain the vision but adjust the strategies and implementation measures in those interim periods.

Vice Chair Thompson - The comp plan element has to be updated how often?  
Staff response: State mandate is every 10 years, but we usually update PROS Element every 6 years at same time of update of PROS Plan (next is 2032); what we're looking at now is a check-in point.

Chair Banaszynski - Support for check in, language "should develop and conduct", public should be included, and check-in point.

### **Task 7**

Commissioner Macias – Remove property owners – call them the public  
Beckwith response: Sometimes it is on their property so it should stay.

### **Email from Commissioner Vanderlinde**

Vice Chair Thompson– emails that the public doesn't have access to. Will they be on record?

Staff response: They can be read into the record.

#1 Tasks 3/4/5 could some be mutually exclusive or limit other financing options?

Beckwith response: No, pretty independent, using general funds, impact fees, potential levy, only issue would be if you don't pass the levy; city has banked capacity.

Vice Chair Thompson – I spoke with NPRSA. There is considerable concern with biting off the management and continuing costs of a building. NPRSA as compared to the Metropolitan Park District (MPD) will be controversial. Not sure if there is a MPD in Bothell or others.

Beckwith response: There would be restrictions.

Staff response: Would have to address some of these legal issues if pursuing MPD.

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Task 4 - Want to capture what we're recommending investigate/research using MPD as a funding resource, create a "should" to take.  
Beckwith response: Task 4, "consider the feasibility."

Commissioner Dorrian - Following is a summary description of the major tasks determined to be necessary proposed to effectively implement the Kenmore Park, Recreation & Open Space (PROS) Plan. The tasks represent actions that would enable the general priorities established by workshops, open houses, the survey of residents, and the survey of registered voters.

Beckwith responded to Commissioner Dorrian's implementation emails.

### **Executive Summary Review**

Commissioner Vanderlinde - Support Option 2 either as Executive Summary or in Appendix.

Commissioner Macias - Support Option 1.

Commissioner Dorrian - Support Option 2.

Commissioner Lassalle - Option 2, concern about the conclusion.

Commissioner Olson - Option 2 more of a Cliff Notes version and if in Appendix then need to reference up front.

Vice Chair Thompson - Option 2 supports the overview. Intent should be up front.

Commissioner Dorrian - Executive Summary, cautious about how we frame things.

Commissioner Lassalle - Executive Summary Option 2 hits on highlights. Revise language that this is not an integrated plan and only provides options. Bring back Option 2 and revise language.

Chair Banaszynski – Hearing support for Exec Summary 2 with the exception of the last section. That paragraph needs to better reflect the document is a

constellation of ideas for the community. May need more comprehensive edits.

## **Appendix F**

Commissioner Macias – All options include a levy lid lift?

Beckwith response: In the way we presented. If you raised REET or dipped into general fund then no.

Commissioner Macias – Is it possible to have other options in there instead of increasing taxes on all options.

Beckwith response: Challenge is the Rec Center needs more in order to pay for it. For those you need a levy or a bond. If I were Council person I would probably look at this and take the Rec Center out and defer it to another time.

Commissioner Dorrian – Clarify that these are funding levels in order to maintain but I think they are to increase correct? I appreciate we will have to do some additions but these levels are to increase service.

Beckwith response: these are Proposed Level of Service

Commissioner Dorrian – When did we decide this was proposed?

Beckwith response: When you went through the Capital Facilities Plan.

Chair Banaszynski – I think we are grappling with the same thing we have been all along. We are sending a proposal but we have not spent the time deciding what the items we are proposing are.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – I think when we present to Council they need to understand.

Commissioner Lassalle – Agree.

Vice Chair Thompson – Agree. The way this is laid out doesn't have any words or music of the city. I don't see the slide rule that there are choices.

Beckwith response: There are creative ways to pay for parks but we are using these three because they are primary ways you pays for parks.

Vice Chair Thompson – Where is that said.

Beckwith response: There are pages in there.

Commissioner Dorrian – Service level budgeting with the bullseye. Can Council get that from this so they know where things would need to be cut.

Beckwith response: Council can change whatever they want to change and how they are going to pay for it.

Chair Banaszynski – Council will have to figure that out on our own. Perhaps that is one of our concerns.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – I appreciate this conversation. The Council will have to take that into consideration. This is what they do with everything. We cannot provide the answer and it would be presumptuous to do it. We need to put the ideas out there and these are the ways we could pay for it. That's our job.

Chair Banaszynski – Agree but people will look at this document and assume we recommended all of these projects. We are not presenting a vision for our parks in that we know exactly what our community wants and/or needs in their parks.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – We are not making recommendations we are making feasibility. These are examples on what the city can look to. It's not within our purview to make the recommendations.

Beckwith: Growth Management Act has a 20 year vision. If the item you want to do is not in your vision you cannot do it. It's better to be optimistic than pessimistic because otherwise you have to go back to RCO and make an amendment.

Chair Banaszynski – We are not creating a vision we are making a list.

Commissioner Lassalle – There are two basketball courts listed. I do not have the vision to know if one of those courts would be better than the other. We are not saying we should have one over the other, we are not saying one is better than the other or one is needed more and that is fine. This is one example of not of what could be not .... If someone is reading this, they would assume it is a comprehensive list which it is in not. I want to be mindful of how it is positioned.

## **F-2**

Commissioner Lassalle - Comfortable with these and the fact that they are revenue avenues.

## **Kenmore ELOS**

Commissioner Lassalle - Good representative of what it is.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – Good exposition of where we are right now.

Commissioner Lassalle – Appreciate the threading the needle, would like to submit to the Commission a cover letter that will explain to the City Council what the document is.

Chair Banaszynski – Seeing nods.

Commissioner Lassalle presented an email he wrote to as a draft to Council when presenting the PROS Plan.

Commissioner Macias– Agree with the first paragraph but Chapter 5 outlines much of these questions. I cannot get behind this and over the last 9 meetings we have done a lot of work to answer these questions.

Commissioner Vanderlinde – Agree with Commissioner Macias. We have worked hard.

Beckwith response: I thought what the letter might be what we talked about tonight. Here are some options and here is what we heard and how we could pay for it. Not this letter which asks for more than what a PROS Plan is required. Planning Commission's primary purpose is to make recommendations on items which are concerned with the Comprehensive Plan.

Chair Banaszynski – Point taken but it will be read by some as we need to do all of these things.

Discussion between staff and PC on what the role of the PC is for the recommendations etc.

Chair Banaszynski - Consensus on a transmittal letter?

Staff response– either you write a letter or present to the council etc like you normally do.

Chair Banaszynski – If we did a letter, I think they would be talking points. This has been a rich discussion, and I think we are finding agreements as well as disagreements. This is good so we are on point when we are speaking to Council. We agree with the first paragraph, yes? The second paragraph – is that where we have divergence? We will maintain the first paragraph and the rest of the letter will be revised. Who wants to do this.

Comm Olson, Comm Lassalle,

Commissioner Dorrian – In Jan can we revisit what the Planning Commission role is.

Next Steps:

Dec 16<sup>th</sup> cancelled

Planning Commission Meeting January 6, 2026, 7pm

8. ADJOURNMENT

Vice Chair Thompson adjourned the meeting at 9:50PM.

*Shannon Tipple-Leen*

---

Planning Commission Clerk

Approved by Planning Commission on: 1/6/2026