

GMHB EXHIBIT 200

2024-01-24 Planning Commission Transcript

0:01

and we are live happy New Year everyone and welcome

0:06

to the January 24 2024 regular hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike

0:14

Murphy the chair tonight's hybrid Planning Commission meeting is brought to you courtesy of Zoom welcome to all

0:22

and thank you for joining us tonight uh Commissioners please have your mics on

0:28

and uh Deb you please call roll thank you and I will echo echo chair Murphy's

0:35

comments happy New Year everyone okay chair Murphy please

0:41

present Vice chair RAB present commissioner accuse pres commissioner

0:49

bazo here commissioner Bozman here commissioner Gils here and commissioner

0:56

Richies here thank you for this meeting we continue to use the

1:03

zoom platform I will do my best to recognize you in the order in which your

1:08

hands are raised after being recognized you may then ask your question make your

1:14

comment uh or whatever uh our first item of business tonight is public

1:20

appearances this is the opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about issues of concern Deputy city clerk is

1:28

there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wishes to address the

1:34

commission thank you Mr chair we do have one person signed up tonight that's Mr Ira appelman okay and if you'll give me

1:42

just a moment I will uh promote him to

1:49

panelist so tonight's agenda will include remote public appearances via

1:55

Zoom individ individuals wishing to address the commit may do so in person

2:02

or by Zoom or telephone provided that they register with the deputy city clerk

2:08

by 4 pm today when it is your turn to speak uh you will be called by name

2:15

remarks must be addressed to the commission as a whole and not to individual Commissioners or staff uh

2:23

please speak audibly state your name and city of residence for the record and you

2:28

will have three minutes to speak speak when your time has ended I will thank you for your comments and move to the

2:35

next speaker or item of business uh Deb please uh I think IRA

2:41

has been promoted as the first Speaker uh can you hear me yes we can go ahead

2:47

okay where's the clock Mr appan we're not as uh tech

2:55

technology Savvy here you know at the Planning Commission we don't have any support staff so time myself okay Ira

3:01

appan Mercer Island I've lived on the island over 60 years and in the last

3:06

over 25 years I've worked to protect Parks all over the island including

3:12

mercerdale Park Luther ring Park up in up in upper and lower kly Park

3:18

Etc uh in all those battles I've generally been fighting staff which is the biggest threat in my opinion to our

3:25

Parks I've been assured that the park zone was supposed to protect our parks

3:30

but staff's version predictably attacks our parts for example staff is advocating a 35 foot maximum Building

3:37

height in all our parts which is prima fascia crazy the lame arguments that

3:42

support this are that zones outside the Town Center have a 35 foot limit which is irrelevant and that Luther Burbank

3:50

Administrative Building would be non-conforming if we don't make it the model for all our Parks instead of the

3:57

staff version there should be a matrix of what uses are allowed in each park

4:02

for Luther B Bank it could say one building of 25 foot height or whatever the height is but that wouldn't be

4:09

allowed in the other Parks as for the 16 Park and wreck issues in exhibit 4 one

4:15

through four seem fine to me five offices can be handled in The Matrix

4:20

only allowed maybe in Luther Burbank six seems fine to me transit stops should be

4:27

eliminated they are always in the right of way not in the Parks or any any place

4:32

else eight limiting the size of signs is probably what's important here but that

4:37

could be uh in The Matrix for different Parks number nine wireless communication

4:42

facilities this should be handled park by Park in The Matrix I led the fight to

4:47

keep wcf's out of kly park which succeeded that WCF is actually in the

4:52

right of way which I argued was common law donation of land for par purposes

4:58

but at Island crest park it made much more sense to put WCF on the light Po since they were already there but

5:04

nowhere else in the park and we succeeded in doing that number 10 habitat restoration seems fine to me

5:11

number 11 is the maximum height which I said should be handled in The Matrix number 12 the city council should

5:18

absolutely be involved in any increase in impervious surfaces even though staff

5:24

says that it's unusual I don't care uh I don't trust staff in making that

5:29

decision 13 and 14 standards are fine uh if they want to make up standards for the parks

5:35

number 15 maximum development can be handled park by Park in The Matrix and

5:41

number 16 the open space trust properties should absolutely be included

5:47

in the park zone that's all I've

5:58

got uh Deb is that the only person we have

6:04

yes sir okay thank you ARA

6:10

thanks okay let's move on to regular business the first item of regular

6:15

business is to review and approve and consider approving the December 6

6:20

special meeting minutes may I have a motion to approve the

6:28

minut still moved second it's been moved by

6:34

commissioner bman and seconded by commissioner bazo um Deb can you please
conduct the

6:41

roll call vote thank you Mr

6:55

chair commissioner Bozman hi Vice chair Ram hi chair Murphy

7:05

hi commissioner accuse hi commissioner bazo hi commissioner GS hi and

7:14

commissioner Riz all right thank you okay motion passes our second and

7:22

final item of regular business is the Planning Commission agenda Bill 24

7:30

-01 comprehensive Plan update park zone first review um before we hear from Adam

7:38

who's primary presenter I believe uh Allison you have a a process issue to

7:45

discuss yeah thanks um Alison van gorp deputy director um I just wanted to jump

7:52

in here before we get started I have spoken to all of you in the last few days and we've also
started to see a lot

7:58

of public comments coming on this issue um kind of related to that um Adam and I

8:04

checked in with our counterparts in the park Department today and we collectively collectively decided that

8:09

it would make sense to schedule a joint meeting of the Planning Commission and the Parks and Recreation Commission um

8:16

to have some more dialogue about this issue and um as you all know our

8:21

schedule's super packed so we were a little concerned about how we would fit that in but fortunately the Parks and

8:28

Recreation Commission canceled their February meeting so they had an opening um in early February and so we're

8:35

looking at scheduling that joint session on February 8th at 6 6m so I wanted to

8:42

check in with you all and see first of all if that date and time could work for you um and then also just wanted to talk

8:50

a little bit about how this could fit into the the bigger process for reviewing the park zone so our thought

8:58

on that that is that tonight um you know we can do our initial review of the

9:04

draft and of the prc's comments if there are items where the commission would

9:10

like additional information or research or if there's options or Alternatives

9:16

that you would like staff to begin um drafting you can give us that direction

9:21

tonight um and then when we meet with the p PRC you'll have uh more

9:27

opportunity to talk with them about the comments that they've provided and any additional insights that they might have

9:34

um and then there'll be a little time between that meeting and our regular February meeting on February 28th and at

9:41

that February 28th meeting is then when we'll need to focus on making some decisions about the direction that you

9:47

would like to give to staff um as to how we should update the draft so then for

9:53

the the final you know we'll bring back a final draft based on your feedback in March for your

10:00

recommendation all right so I'll stop there if there's questions I can take them and also if we could just do like a

10:06

quick thumbs up poll or something on that date of the 8th I would appreciate

10:11

it okay well let's start there since we have some thumbs already

10:21

up I'm I'm giving it a tentative thumbs just I'm logging in here uh I've got to

10:27

check one thing so okay feel free to send me a message on email or something too if you need to check

10:33

and let me know later I'm

10:38

good okay here's unanimous great that's wonderful thanks

10:45

everybody for being flexible um are there I see at least one hand there for questions yeah

10:53

Carolyn I really feel a lot more comfortable with this approach going forward um I feel like we get a chance

11:00

to um you know learn tonight robust discussion learning questions and we

11:06

also get to talk to the PRC about what's on their mind um I like it thank you

11:12

very much for the this direction you're

11:19

welcome any other thoughts about that process or Okay so let's talk a little bit

11:29

before we get started about the process for tonight um I know there's some concern

11:36

and and you know focusing on the PRC input prior to having the discussion

11:45

with them may seem to be put putting the cart before the horse um so then the

11:52

question is how do we want to proceed with tonight's discussion um and you know I mean one

12:00

approach would be to Simply start going through their proposal um and addressing concerns and

12:08

comments uh and see how far we

12:13

get Carolyn you mean start our work tonight

12:19

with going through their proposals or do that at some point during the night well after we hear of course from Adam but we

12:26

would then have a chance to ask him questions and we would start on our

12:31

discussion if we have time you mean prioritize their recommendations prior

12:38

to our discussion and learning uh well we're going to be learning from them because we have a

12:44

compressed schedule uh whether we'd have time tonight to actually discuss much other than questions is not clear to me

12:51

but the but I don't want to M miss an opportunity to at least start the

12:57

discussion uh of the issues because there are things that we're concerned about that the PRC may not be so yeah I

13:05

I'm really in favor of discussing what they have raised as concerns but I I

13:11

just feel that as a commission we probably need to discuss the park zone and our own thoughts and concerns about

13:17

it first before getting to the prc's concerns so that would be my proposal is to change the order of that that

13:25

discussion in our agenda but also I would um propose that you know we just

13:31

not take votes on their proposals tonight certainly discuss them uh ask

13:37

questions about them but that their proposals remain in our decision Matrix

13:42

for our February meeting which is at the end of the month

13:49

um and take votes on them at that time when I also feel that if my own comments

13:54

are due on January 31st I'm going to be doing a deep dive on this over the next week and you know at that point I will

14:01

have the kind of knowledge to take votes on these these things okay

14:09

Adam um yeah I I think that's I think it's good yeah let's let's definitely

14:16

have our own discussion here um I wonder and maybe the discussion will take us in

14:22

that direction but I think there's a few obvious things that we could probably come to a
recommend on the on as a

14:30

commission here and that might strengthen our discussions um with the PRC also like hey
a b and c have no

14:39

business being in the Parks do you guys agree yeah okay good so I I wouldn't be

14:45

afraid of making some recommendations as I think there's some obvious uh some

14:51

obvious ones here um so yeah just just wanted to say that and also like I

14:58

understand there's a compressed schedule but I think to me what's most important is
getting this right right our our city

15:05

has kind of Taken taken the word of us and and the council and and the Parks

15:11

Commission and given 16 years of funding um so I understand schedules are

15:16

important but we have to do this right so I'm I'm not going to rush

15:21

it Victor uh I'm not going to belabor it I

15:27

I'm going to Echo the last last two points that were made I'd like to see a kind of initial reaction from the

15:32

commission tonight uh given the fact that we have an a meeting jointly with

15:37

the the PRC um I think you know that feels like the the right point to really

15:44

uh synchronize or or bring together their feedback and our feedback um but

15:50

in terms of prioritizing tonight i' I'd like to be able to get our questions

15:55

answered and to get our initial feedback I certainly have

16:00

feedback okay Carolyn is that an old hand or no I just wanted to uh add that

16:06

I can see um Adam rug's a point on this that since we are going to be meeting with the PRC maybe there are a few

16:13

things we'd like to go into that meeting having some you know a high level

16:18

viewpoint on you know so thank you okay well let's

16:24

um let's turn it over to Adam and get his Adam Zach and get his input and uh

16:31

presentation and questions we have answered and then we'll take it from

16:37

there great thank you um let me share my

16:44

screen all right so everybody can see that there um let's see so tonight we'll

16:51

be talking about the the park zone here our purpose is really to provide you with um an introduction to this initial

17:00

park zone draft and then start to get those responses to um that Parks and

17:06

Recreation Commission input um a as per the discussion you just had um it sounds

17:11

like we will hold off on responding to most of those but I think when we get to that point in the presentation I'll just

17:18

pull up the The Matrix that you had exhibit four of the commission Bill and

17:23

then we can walk through each of those line items from from that um real quick um to give you an idea of of where you

17:31

want to go um in these next couple of steps so tonight I'll start with a

17:36

presentation on the background kind of how we got to where we are and where we're going with this um and then give

17:43

you an overview of the initial draft um looking at what the the different sections of the of the draft do and then

17:52

where some of those decision points are for the for the Planning Commission um and then um and then like I said I'll

17:58

walk us through um that Matrix and look at those um those comments from the PRC

18:05

and I'll I'll also gather your your questions so that I can prepare responses um for our next meeting um for

18:11

the February packet so to start out with the the park zone is um it's a new Zone that would

18:19

regulate development in city parks um it's it was adopted or we were we were

18:26

uh directed to undertake this project by the city council um with the comprehensive Plan update that we're

18:33

currently um currently in the process of and and as currently drafted um the park

18:39

zone would apply to our city owned leased or managed parks and really the

18:45

the overall idea is to ensure that development in those Parks is consistent with our adopted Pros plan um and other

18:53

uh City plans including the comprehensive plan so um you you probably all know

19:00

this by now but the growth management act requires us to complete our comprehensive Plan update by the end of

19:06

of this year by December 31st of 2024 and so this fits within that um that

19:12

comprehensive plan periodic review process that we're doing um the the

19:17

scope of work for that uh project was set by the city council in 2012 and then supplemented earlier or

19:25

in um Mid 2023 um and drafting this park zone was

19:31

included in that city council adopted scope of work so that's where they directed us to to undertake this project

19:38

and um being a new Zone um the park zone would be adopted excuse me in title 19

19:44

of the Mercer Island City code and that that city code or that

19:49

title 19 um requires some specific legislative review process so that's

19:55

where we're we're working towards now currently we're in the very beginning of that process um but that's the the

20:03

legislative review process requires the Planning Commission to hold a public hearing before making a recommendation

20:08

to the city council so we're we're working through that that process that's uh established in the

20:15

code so for the process um there's kind of five main pieces of the process um

20:22

there's the project beginning which is the the initial drafting of of a draft for review and

20:31

amendments um which the staff prepared that initial draft um to kind of get the

20:37

get the conversation started um and then this the project beginning also included

20:42

a Parks and Recreation Commission um session where they um they didn't

20:48

necessarily recommend a draft but they they did go through and they provided those comments on that that first

20:53

initial draft um we are currently at the second stage of the process the Planning

21:00

Commission review um and this will be uh a series of a couple of meetings between now and March um or the end of February

21:08

uh to arrive at at an an updated draft of the park zone um and so following

21:16

that um we then would take this through the rest of the comprehensive plan um

21:22

process where we would go we're planning an open house in the spring uh where we

21:27

would gather some comments on the draft and then following that open house the Planning Commission would hold their

21:33

tuneup meeting and respond to those comments that are received at the open house and then hold a public hearing and

21:40

then ultimately make a recommendation to the city council and then the city council will review um the draft um and

21:47

consider whether to adopt it or not um I do see a a hand up

21:57

there so I've got a couple of questions these reviews that happen

22:05

later these when we say PC responds to comments PC makes a recommendation to

22:11

the council those are comprehensive plan specific correct they are not park zone

22:18

specific well it so you will be responding to comments on the

22:23

comprehensive plan periodic review or the the update that we're working on of which part of that will be this uh this

22:31

park zone and so the the public will be able to comment on both the park zone

22:37

and the rest of the comprehensive plan um update and you during that tuneup

22:43

process the Planning Commission will be able to respond to all of those comments that we receive whether they're on the

22:49

parks own or on other parts of the comprehensive Plan update so I I think

22:54

you have a a number of members of the public on this call tonight and I um I'm

23:01

I'm going to assume that they are very interested specifically in the Parks proposal and so it would be useful to

23:09

understand uh and apparently apparently this is probably under PC review that

23:15

where you had that you are here thing how many meetings are we having on

23:23

the parks proposal specifically and when are they I understand we have a meeting tonight we just scheduled a meeting on

23:29

February 8th what are the other meetings specifically on the parks Zone

23:35

proposal sure so specifically on the park zone proposal February 28th will be

23:42

the next Planning Commission meeting yeah and then following that um with

23:48

that input that that we receive on the 28th we'll provide an updated draft um

23:54

that incorporates the changes that the Planning Commission has proposed and then the Planning Commission will

24:00

review that draft at one one meeting in March and then that would all be in

24:06

advance of that open house uh got it so so there will be a a park specific

24:12

meeting or a park zone specific meeting in March yes okay got it to review that

24:18

second draft where okay thank you thanks for the clarification I think

24:24

that is very helpful yeah um so moving from forward in the process

24:31

um there's uh I'd like to move now to kind of an overview of the park zone

24:37

itself um so the park zone is composed of a few different

24:43

components um the first being development regulations um so these are

24:49

the sections of title 19 merer Island City code that would regulate the

24:55

development so these are the the rules for how development may occur within that zone as currently drafted there

25:02

would be two new code sections established um to regulate development in the park zone um and we'll we'll look

25:09

at each of those new code sections in a little more detail in a minute um there's also there would be amendments

25:15

to two existing sections of the city code um that'd be um micc

25:22

19104 that's the Zone establishment section of the code so that that section is establishes each of the zones within

25:29

the city um and then there's also uh would be some amendments to uh 19 uh

25:36

16010 the definition section that would be to establish some new definitions for

25:42

those uses and um well for the uses within the Zone there's also a zoning

25:49

map included um and this would show where those development regulations

25:54

would apply throughout the city so the zoning map shows those uh the zones throughout the city

26:01

um a note on the zoning map um this the

26:07

current draft does not include the street end um The Landings and it does

26:12

not include Aubrey Davis Park which is within the I90 um ride of way um uh

26:20

which is owned by wash Dot and I'm sure we'll end up talking about that a bit um

26:26

the the Third component of the park zone is the land use map um and this is part

26:32

of the land use element of the comprehensive plan and this establishes the generalized location of future land

26:37

uses and it's based on the policies in that land use element and it's kind of

26:43

the it forms kind of the baseline from which we would derive our zoning so we

26:48

would have we have kind of General future land use categories on the land use map that then are translated into

26:55

more specific zones on the zone in map um so those are the three kind of bigger

27:00

components of the park zone now looking at the draft

27:07

development regulations um so that first piece there there are five pieces that

27:12

we'll be taking a look at or that I'll be giving you an overview of tonight um that make up those uh regul regulatory

27:20

changes um that's the Zone establishment section The Zone purpose and designation

27:26

criteria the permitted land uses development standards and definitions so

27:32

we'll start with Zone establishment so this is uh there are

27:38

minor amendments to 1901 040 um that are required to create a new

27:45

Zone um and those the proposed amendments in this section um of the

27:50

code are primarily limited to just those required to establish a new Zone and

27:56

some other minor edits to this section just to improve the clarity um

28:03

there so moving now to the new sections of the development code um that are

28:08

proposed um there's the park zone purpose and the park zone designation

28:15

criteria um these are these would be new sections of the code um and the purpose

28:21

is really the section that that outlines um why uh we are creating a

28:28

park zone what the what the reason for that zone is um and in in the current

28:34

draft um the purpose is uh outlining that we're establishing these regulations for Parks uh because their

28:42

uh land uses are different from other zones and it's it's really focusing on

28:47

the continuation of of recreational uses in those um those Parklands so you can see the specific language of the park

28:54

zone purpose um in the draft the the the next section in uh the proposed code is

29:00

the designation criteria and these are criteria that set the rules for when those lands may be zoned Parks so when

29:08

we would consider um a a a redesignation to Zone lands Parks they would need to

29:16

meet the criteria that are set in this um in this code section and there are

29:21

really two criteria that are proposed in the current draft and that's that lands must be city-owned leased or managed and

29:29

that the council must make findings uh that that zoning is consistent with the

29:34

uh Zone purpose which is um established in the in the previous section so those are the two designation criteria in the

29:42

current draft the third section of the park zone

29:48

is is the permitted uses and as we were uh as we're looking at these um some of

29:54

the tradeoffs with when we're considering land use uses um allowed land uses is ensuring that they're you

30:01

know Brad enough to um so that the city can do what it needs to do to maintain its parks and realize its pros plan but

30:09

then also narrow enough to preserve Parks from being developed with those incompatible uses and I think as we as

30:16

we work through the drafts of this code um those those kind of competing or not

30:22

competing but those those B those two things will need to be balanced and I I think you'll um have some good

30:29

conversations about what broad enough and narrow enough really means um I think that'll be kind of the focus of of

30:35

that discussion um it's it's important as we as we think about these land uses to

30:40

keep in mind too that any allowed land uses go through a city planning process

30:46

um so it this includes you know setting the budget to undertake that uh Capital

30:52

Improvement putting the project onto our Capital Improvement plan and a design

30:57

view for those for those projects um so it there's there's more more process

31:02

than just the permitting process the um the current draft um the

31:10

proposed draft has these 11 proposed land uses uh listed so recreational uses

31:16

recreational facilities agricultural activities government offices and government services
public parking uh

31:23

parking structures and underground parking temporary uses and structur Transit stops
public art signs wireless

31:31

communication facilities and utilities um so as we uh as we work on

31:37

getting to the next draft of uh the park zone you the Planning Commission can

31:43

refine this list um again kind of Nar navigating that balance between broad

31:50

enough and narrow enough um and so if there's a if there's a use on this list

31:55

as we're considering the next um the next draft if there's a use on this list that you'd like to modify or um remove

32:02

or um you know provide some kind of specific uh conditions for we can we can

32:09

add those into the next draft so as you're reviewing this this initial draft you can consider those potential changes

32:16

to um to this list of permitted land uses and you'll see when we get to the PRC comments that the PRC provided some

32:23

input to on these permitted land uses so I I imagine that we will probably spend

32:29

some time um on these 11 um topics or permitted land uses um in the next

32:37

stage uh Adam you uh Kate has a question yeah um quick question about um

32:46

Enterprise uh opportunities I know in the past there was some discussion of um

32:53

the potential for the I think it's the boiler rooms down by the the new L Burbank doca it used to have

33:01

concessions um and I know Seattle Parks actually makes quite a bit of money on

33:07

uh Enterprise uses that are beneficial to the city um is can you just give us

33:13

as we're contemplating this list um uh an update and maybe it's not tonight on

33:20

what the current thinking is at the city about uh Enterprise um not sure if I'm

33:27

using the right word but it's you know leases for services that benefit the city but that are privately

33:34

run yeah I will um I will address that in the next um kind of in more detail in

33:41

in the next memo um but I think that's definitely um it it's It's tricky

33:48

because that would vary depending on what the proposal were in terms of the this list of of allowed uses that's the

33:56

that's the quick version but there's I I can get into more Nuance in in a memo for you thank you I I appreciate that

34:04

and if that could cover um you know I'm sure you will consider pros and cons but

34:09

also um there are a number of services that um uh residents have asked for um

34:18

and I just want to make sure that we're not and and also knowing that preferences change over time um you know

34:27

recreational facilities is is pretty vague and I I can see covers tennis courts or pickle ball courts whatever

34:33

the fashion of the day is um but I think some of those some of those items would

34:39

probably be of high concern if they're too vague um yeah thanks so

34:45

much yeah thanks that's a that's a great question so I'll make sure to address

34:52

that um so moving to the next section

34:57

section four of the um proposed code is um another new section of the

35:04

development code uh which would establish development standards for the park zone and these development

35:10

standards include like parking requirements setbacks the maximum height limit um the improvi surfaces limits um

35:19

and they're intended to development standards in general are intended to help reduce the impact of allowed uses

35:26

on neighboring land uses and then also vice versa so you know we we establish

35:31

Landscaping requirements between parking areas and residential zones so that you

35:37

know there's some kind of buffer between those two uses that that type of thing

35:42

and um in the draft here before you today those standards are focused on

35:48

kind of ensuring that this Parks development occurs kind of consistent with our comprehensive plan and the pros

35:55

plan um but there's 's a fair amount of um discretion in how we set those

36:01

setbacks um and height standards um and those those types of um development

36:06

standards and you can see the full text of the proposed development standards on page three line 37 of exhibit one um but

36:15

I'll go through a quick uh summary of of the the proposed development

36:21

standards um here um so for setbacks um there's a the propos standard is that

36:27

there would be no setback required between park zone um and the public institutional Zone um commercial and

36:35

mixed use zones and then there would be a 20 foot setback between park zone and

36:41

residential zones and um there would be some developments that would be exempt

36:46

from those setbacks so picnic tables fences Gates coverts Trails landscaping

36:52

and parking areas would all be exempt from those setbacks

36:57

um in terms of the building height uh the maximum the currently proposed

37:02

maximum Building height is a 35 foot maximum which is approximately three

37:08

stories um so this would cover um most of the the buildings um sorry like the

37:15

Luther burb Bank Administrative Building um and myac would um both you know be

37:21

conforming to that standard um and then the impervious surfaces standard um is

37:27

that there would be no net new impervious surfaces unless authorized by

37:32

an adopted Park master plan um or an adopted City plan and the Ada

37:39

plan um and then uh in the current Pro uh proposal uh emergency vehicle Lanes

37:46

trails and synthetic tur Turf athletic fields would be exempt from that know net new impervious surface standard Zach

37:54

uh can we interrupt you it looks like K has another question Kate is that a new

38:01

hand uh I do not show my hand

38:07

up but I'll raise and lower it okay it's go on now y there we go okay never mind

38:16

thanks um okay so then there's a couple more development standards uh there are

38:23

standard proposed standards for parking and Lighting um the current proposed

38:28

parking standard does not establish a minimum number of parking spaces um

38:34

rather it it allows the city engineer to determine um the necessary number of

38:39

parking spaces per development so this uh allows when uh When developing

38:46

something we can look at it more in a case by case rather than set a baseline um there's also a screening

38:53

requirement between parking areas and residential zones um that Landscaping

38:58

requirement um and then also of note here there's a relationship between the parking and that impervious surface

39:04

standard that we were just looking at that that impervious surface requirement would likely limit the amount of new

39:11

parking that would be um created unless it was already part of an adopted City

39:16

plan um so that's the parking those are the parking standards and then the

39:22

lighting standards wait actually I see a hand before I move from parking yeah

39:29

uh so you just said something that caught my attention you said uh kind of when we would be developing something in

39:36

the context of parking can you give me an example of what you would be developing in our Parks sure so it if we

39:44

were adding like a tennis court or a skate park or something like that um we could establish standards that say when

39:52

you add a playground to a park um you know for each square foot of of of

39:57

playground you must provide X number of parking spaces that that sort of

40:05

thing but the but the city engineer would do that that wouldn't be done in the code correct yeah rather than rather

40:13

than set a standard like that uh we the current draft proposes a flexible standard where

40:20

the city engineer could determine that on a case-by Case basis and

40:26

and and chair Murphy if this isn't the right time to ask questions I I I'm happy to hold um but I can you just can

40:36

you give me the logic behind not specifying parking

40:42

here but we do specify it in other parts of the city for like for instance the Town

40:47

Center sure so in in Parks I think part of the part of the concern well one of

40:53

the interesting things here about this zone is that it is a an instance of the city kind of regulating itself and so as

41:03

the this would the current standard as proposed would Grant the city a certain amount of flexibility in determining so

41:11

that we wouldn't end up with um a significant increase in parking that was

41:16

set and determined in the code um just because we had a ratio a required ratio

41:22

so this gives the city a little more flexibility to deter the correct amount of parking um per

41:30

development because the alternative could lead to a situation where extra

41:37

parking were required that maybe we didn't want to provide in our city

41:45

parks Adam and just to see this this section E4 minimum parking

41:53

requirements that's still subject to to whatever impervious surface um stuff we recommend

42:02

right or can the city engineer overrule that no it would still

42:09

need to meet the impervious surface standard yeah okay so that is a pretty significant um and as we think about

42:17

impervious surface I mean that's a pretty significant piece of this puzzle

42:22

right um okay thanks

42:34

hey yeah I'm curious and maybe you'll get to this later how tree

42:40

canopy fits into this equation um it just in my studies as an urban

42:47

Forester um you know a lot of the compacted grass areas in our Park are

42:53

almost as impervious as concrete and I'm wondering about how you're going to

42:58

calculate no net loss there are definitely um hspf and other hydrologic

43:05

models that can evaluate the impacts of different surfaces on um storm water

43:11

problems and and grass falls far short of uh Urban Forest canopy um um both

43:20

sparse trees and and definitely a natural Forest condition so I'm I'm just

43:26

curious and just putting it out there that I think this no net loss needs to include consideration of grass surfaces

43:34

as well and um conversion to forested condition in in the calculus

43:49

thanks right um sorry I I didn't hear a question in there I I don't know I don't

43:55

want to leave you unanswered but it's a comment more than a a

44:01

question okay I just wanted to make sure I wasn't uh missing a question so yeah I

44:07

mean I I guess I could I guess I could put a question and I could play Jeopardy here and say um what is your plan for considering uh

44:16

grass and Forest canopy I'm personally like disappointed with how much grass we

44:21

we have and maintain in M particularly in areas that aren't High use um it just

44:27

seems like a huge wasted opportunity in a lot of areas to uh improve our storm

44:32

water system and take some pressure off our storm water system by converting some lawn to Urban Forest um I I have

44:40

been Pro park zone for some time and uh and that was one of the reasons I was

44:45

hoping to see some really strong canopy increase um goals or language in this

44:51

plan and I'm not really seeing it

44:56

okay um so I can partially answer that question

45:01

off the cop here so there's currently uh trees are

45:07

regulated by a separate section of the code so we have our our tree code in chapter

45:13

1910 um and any any development in our city parks would have to comply with the

45:20

tree code um I don't have a memorized chapter in verse so um I other questions

45:26

about uh the tree code would need to be held for um the next time um but the

45:33

other piece of the the question that I heard there was about impervious surface and grass and I would say that it would

45:41

be worthwhile to look at the definition of impervious surface um because that

45:47

tells you exactly what is counted in that Nonet new currently grass would not

45:53

be included in that definition but there's a a series of other things that are included in there um so that might

45:59

be that might be worth um taking a look at and then I I can get into a little bit more specifics I think um in the in

46:09

the staff report kind of addressing that larger question about

46:15

um grass and can be

46:22

yeah um so the final piece of um the development standards are lighting

46:29

standards um and these are um based on the international dark sky Association

46:36

uh recommendations to minimize lighting impacts um so uh We've we've looked at

46:41

lighting standards for some other uses in the past in the recent past um these

46:46

would be pretty consistent with those requiring that new lighting be shielded and directed downwards um so that um to

46:55

prevent the light trespass onto neighboring properties Victor do you have a

47:04

question I do um do we have a sense

47:10

of of the existing lighting that we have in our Parks today how much of it is

47:15

compliant with what's here and how much of it is not

47:20

compliant um I don't have that ready in the hopper but I I could that up for the

47:26

next the next round and and I guess the follow on question to that is if it's not

47:32

compliant is that um does that require a

47:37

retrofit if it would not requ if this is passed and it's not compliant do we have

47:43

to retrofit a bunch of stuff it would be non-conforming um and So eventually as

47:49

the as those that lighting was redeveloped it would be um required to

47:55

eventually come into conformance um Conformity um but I can I can give you a

48:01

little more information about that um gate do you have another question or

48:08

is that still up NOP it's a new one um I'm I'm curious

48:15

about the downward facing lighting and whether or not um shorelines and someon

48:20

habitat are considered or is that considered in another part of the code

48:25

um it seems like it appears that these impacts are generally um for

48:33

residential uses um but I'm I'm very concerned about lighting and salmon

48:38

pration on the shorelines so that is uh lighting is um

48:44

or Shoreline regulations are addressed in chapter 1913

48:50

um so and I don't believe for most uses

48:55

um there aren't specific lighting standards in the shoreline um but that

49:01

would be a separate code Amendment from the park zone um so it would be handled in that

49:08

chapter 1913 and then in terms of like wetlands and um and stream buffers um

49:16

those kinds of critical areas the critical areas code is in chapter 1907 of uh the city code and that also

49:24

has Reg ulations for um what what can and can't happen within the buffer um

49:31

and lighting is um I believe covered in some of that

49:39

yeah all right so the fifth uh component of the park

49:47

zone is amendments to Mercer Island City code

49:52

19161 0 these would establish Lish new definitions for terms that are used um

49:59

in the park zone that are not currently defined in um the city code um so those

50:05

are the um nine uh definitions here um we can uh we can through your review you

50:15

can propose amendments to um we can we can go through and look at uh amendments to those definitions um as we get to the

50:23

second draft um but those are those are the terms that are proposed for a

50:30

definition so that concludes my over overview of the park zone um so those

50:35

are kind of the the five areas that you can focus um your comments on and focus

50:42

on finding those amendments that the commission would like to make um to the

50:48

park zone those are kind of the more consequential um pieces of this or the the the um the regulations for that zone

50:59

um now um kind of moving to the Parks and Recreation Commission input um

51:06

before we move on that Adam Kate do you have another question my hand is not up

51:15

oh I'll do the thing again uh Chris you have a question yeah

51:23

this is sort of a naive question question but it the current status of

51:29

the parks is they're zoned variously um but recognized as Parks but

51:35

as a zoning matter something like you know Pioneer Park is currently zoned as

51:41

do you know what it is um I believe that's R 8.4 um but to to answer the question yes

51:49

all the parks are zoned differently or not all of them but many of them are zoned differently

51:56

as a zoning matter if they were developed there would be you know they

52:01

would have the same requirements as their Zone and so the park zone as even

52:08

as proposed substantially limits the ability to use those for other than Park

52:14

purposes over what their current zoning is now there's still a design process and a lot of other things involv but

52:19

just as the zoning matter there's a substantial restriction on part on uses

52:26

within Parks because of the if we adopt the park zone that is that right correct

52:32

the list of allowed uses in this zone is shorter than many of the other zones um

52:38

in in the city um I don't know that I would necessarily say that it's

52:44

um more restrictive I think the advantage here is that the park zone

52:50

would create a uniform set of regulations that applies in every Park

52:56

um rather than a patchwork of several different types of regulations applying

53:01

in different city parks okay

53:08

Victor so I I have a series of questions that I that I want to ask and Soh what

53:14

I'll do is I'll just leave my hand up and you can cycle through I'll ask one question then you can cycle through the other questions um but uh I'm gonna

53:23

start with following up on commissioner gs's question and the

53:31

answer we had Mr appelman um speak earlier at the beginning of the meeting

53:39

and propose um let I I I'm going to

53:46

characterize it as a teered Parks approach um and it seems like you're

53:54

proposing a a one siiz fits-all approach I'm

54:00

wondering if you could just I'd love to hear your comments on on Pros cons

54:09

thoughts because I and I think you know as I I'll give an example we've got

54:15

Luther verbank par which you know has non-conforming buildings it has all

54:22

kinds of stuff um it has government offices and then we have Wildwood Park

54:27

on the south end um two very very different Parks MH um so can you just

54:34

comment on Mr appleman's proposal sure if the if the

54:39

Planning Commission would like to explore um a tiered approach or uh that

54:44

kind of Matrix that would um you know create uh you know uh you you could name

54:52

it any kind of thing like a tier one park is something that's over X number of acres and has these things in it and

54:58

this is what's allowed there um that's a that's an approach that other jurisdictions have used um where they

55:05

would have like community park and then like Regional Park something like that and then have different um different

55:12

uses allowed there so if if that's something that the Planning Commission is interested in pursuing we could

55:18

incorporate that into the second draft but that's that would be up to

55:27

um up to the commission yeah

55:37

Carolyn oh okay um I just wanted to ask about sort of sort of our agenda this

55:43

evening so some of our commissioners are asking their questions as we go through the material and others are kind of

55:50

listening to a presentation and figuring they're going to come back and be able to go through the whole thing

55:55

and ask their questions or you know promote discussion about certain things is is that is that the correct

56:01

understanding uh yes okay thanks in other words you're not

56:09

foreclosed to comment on one of those sections or to question on one of those sections because Adam has gone through

56:16

that and Victor or someone else has asked a question about it

56:23

well I guess I then then just ask what was the understanding that we were maybe

56:29

supposed to perceive that we should bring up all of the stuff that's on our mind as we go

56:35

or uh is it just fine to do it either way well we seem to be doing it this way

56:42

to start with because people have some preliminary questions and we have Adam

56:48

here we have his presentation and so I think uh it's it's prudent to take the

56:54

opportunity to to ask questions uh we're not debating uh the choice between

57:00

tiered or Matrix approach the question was simply asked is that a possibility

57:06

so um for examp I'm very comfortable with anything anybody's brought up it's

57:12

just that I you know had the understanding at the beginning that we were kind of listening to a presentation

57:17

I I'm just sort of holding all my stuff just listening you know and so I'm hoping that we can come back because I I

57:25

just feel it be a little chaotic for me to try to do it some other way at this point so okay okay
you're you're welcome

57:33

to do it your way Adam um I guess yeah I was kind of

57:39

holding back some comments or not comments but questions too um I I

57:46

guess I I would I would want to rewind and ask a question about Aubrey Davis

57:53

Park um why why is it not in our in that proposed park

58:04

zone sure I will you you asked that question too in an email um I'll I'll

58:10

respond it it'll be better for me to respond in a written form um just because it it's um more
comple it's a

58:20

complicated thing the short answer is that it it is in the wash do right away

58:26

um it's part of a larger parcel um and so it would probably result in a split

58:31

Zone um which is uh another piece of that that is um maybe not ideal um but

58:41

um if there is a proposal to Zone it as a park um we can if that's what the

58:48

Planning Commission wants to recommend the Planning Commission can recommend
that but I'll I'll give you a longer

58:54

answer in in um in The Matrix in respon understood although I you know split

59:00

Zone we we saw that with the B zone right for um h&t a few meetings ago so

59:07

seems like there's precedent already for that where a Zone doesn't line up one

59:13

for one with it so oh no worries I understand you want a larger answer um

59:20

but that yeah that was a I'm sure we'll talk more later today

59:26

so Victor back to you uh so I'm going to

59:32

extend Adam's question and so he took part of my question my my my additional

59:37

portion of it was can you just explain the logic behind not including Street ends and

59:44

landings so those Street ends and landings are primarily right away um and they're

59:53

not necessarily they're right rights of way that provides some Park amenities some park-like amenities but are not

59:59

necessarily specifically parks and rights of way have specific things um

1:00:06

specific rules governing what can take place in the right of way um

1:00:12

and so we decided to not uh propose those to be included with the um in the

1:00:18

park zone but it's kind of the same the same deal um it it we can provide a

1:00:24

little bit more information if there's more information needed um and the Planning Commission can um if that's

1:00:31

what you would like to recommend your uh you can include that in your recommendation but essentially the the

1:00:37

rights of way have their own rules that that govern them and and I'm I'm having a hard time seeing it on the map right

1:00:44

now but like so for instance Caulkins Landing is not a park um I don't believe caulking Landing

1:00:50

is a park there's there's one Landing that is a part that is proposed to be a park but that's because it's actually

1:00:57

part of the park system it's not necessarily the right

1:01:06

way uh Adam Zach um can you present next time around or

1:01:14

via email a little more detail on the pros and cons of including the road ends into the park

1:01:23

system I mean I understand you're what you're saying is they have different

1:01:28

rules but has rice of way they're not

1:01:33

necessarily very useful anymore because we don't have fairies um now I'm know that there are

1:01:41

several where where people have access to driveways in those locations and so that

1:01:49

may complicate it but I think it would be a worthwhile exercise to consider the

1:01:56

pros and cons of including them in our Park system yeah I'll make sure to to

1:02:02

write that up for um for everyone I just wanted to add really quick one thing to think about there

1:02:09

that'll be included in that analysis is that those Street ends you know they are

1:02:14

essentially a street end and so many of them have a lot of utility infrastructure in them including pump

1:02:20

stations and underground pipes so that was part of the consideration as well is that sometimes those properties are

1:02:27

needed for utility purposes as well

1:02:32

okay Angie you had your hand up did you not wanna I was actually I had two

1:02:39

questions that I was going to toss in one of them I can't find but I think I do want to make a

1:02:45

comment um I'm Gonna Save Adam and Allison and I'm going to stick my foot

1:02:51

in my mouth but they're probably gonna understand why I'm doing it um just because I've negotiated mitigation deals

1:02:58

with wash do through the region as it relates to very large Transportation

1:03:03

projects uh it would be important for you to understand that the I90 Corridor as an open space Corridor has a lot of

1:03:11

strings attached related to the mitigation agreements that Mercer Island made with wash do with the state so Adam

1:03:19

and Allison's ability to actually speak into that here at a recorded public meeting with all of the nuances is

1:03:26

really challenging now they can p point to a lot of different layers but I will tell you just based on having been a

1:03:33

wash dot employee negotiating these and recognizing how particular the state is

1:03:39

about making sure they have constant access and maintenance needs to ride of way the fact that we have an open space

1:03:47

program with a board of directors that's managing that for our use is remarkable

1:03:53

given all the other examples throughout the region and so I'm just saying now as

1:03:59

a planning commissioner I'm disinclined to try and untangle

1:04:06

that and then I'm going to go find my question and I'll be back later okay back to

1:04:13

Victor so um I keep getting set up on these uh continuing on the Open Space

1:04:20

theme my next question is I see a bunch of open space that is that's got hash

1:04:26

marks that indicates it's a park but it doesn't say it's a park it just says open space so for instance Southeast

1:04:34

53rd Place open space is uh or Parkwood

1:04:39

Ridge open space is that all included in the in the

1:04:44

Parks proposal would that would that be part of uh what we're talking about yes

1:04:50

those those Open Spaces would be included in the zone

1:04:58

yeah okay um practical question about tiered

1:05:08

approach um would something like that allow us

1:05:14

to provide some of the protections we might be seeking with a park zone

1:05:20

for places like Street ends or AUB Davis or whatnot um but give them special

1:05:28

dispensation for existing uses and agreements um would a

1:05:34

tiered approach allow us some flexibility there that we could possibly preclude include them in

1:05:42

the zone and preclude things that are not related

1:05:47

to um their current use and current um

1:05:52

use agreements the tiered approach so if we were to

1:05:59

create um if the Planning Commission were to create uh like a matrix right that says in these Parks these uses are

1:06:06

allowed and in these Parks these uses are allowed would allow you a lot of flexibility in determining you know the

1:06:14

allowed uses in each of those like tiers and some of that flexibility could

1:06:19

probably be um used in a way to to um account for some of those existing

1:06:27

uses in one park that you may not want to allow in another Park um it the one

1:06:34

of the benefits of that process is that or that approach is that it would give you some that amount of flexibility I

1:06:41

think the the downside of that is that it becomes a lot more complicated and so

1:06:48

deter determining those those types of uses that you may want to allow in one park and not the other

1:06:55

um that would be a challenging thing for the Planning Commission to work out I think but that's not a reason to not do

1:07:02

it that's just that's just one of the implications of going that

1:07:07

route and there's in terms of like existing uses there there are some

1:07:13

options that we could look at um for existing uses being allowed um we would

1:07:20

need to do a dive into that if that if um the Planning Commission goes in in

1:07:25

that direction yeah Victor your hands still up so I

1:07:32

assume you have more questions yeah I do um so in the current proposal the

1:07:38

language around government buildings um and in the way that it is

1:07:44

written about government buildings in public parks hypothetically speaking with that

1:07:51

language would it be possible to put City Hall in

1:07:56

Park uh government offices and government services in the current draft

1:08:02

would be allowed as a permitted use um and that would include something like a

1:08:08

city hall um but I think that that's from a regulatory standpoint

1:08:16

and then there's yeah there's also that planning piece of it but I think you acknowledged that in the question so I

1:08:21

think that's one of the things that um you all will have to kind of weigh out

1:08:27

when thinking about government offices and services and I assume you're familiar with the history of the city

1:08:33

hall proposal in mercerdale park I have I've heard mention yeah yeah

1:08:45

okay all right any other questions so I guess at this point it would be helpful it might be helpful to reiterate that um

1:08:53

we are asking for written questions and comments on this first draft by uh

1:09:00

January 31st um so that's next Wednesday so if there's questions that you

1:09:06

have um that if like if commissioner bazo finds that written question that

1:09:12

she may have and wants to share it uh we can we can take that by uh January 31st

1:09:20

um I see Jeff has uh raised his hand um yeah just uh can everyone hear me

1:09:27

actually yeah great thank you uh for the record Jeff Thomas uh CPD director I

1:09:33

wanted to before the the subject matter moves along here um too far wanted to

1:09:40

double back on just a couple of things quickly the first thing was the um the

1:09:45

street ends um Allison came on screen there a few moments ago and spoke to it

1:09:51

I I wanted to emphasize um these Street ends are public rights of way um and they have

1:10:01

varying degrees of significant utility infrastructure underneath the surface so

1:10:08

while we certainly use some of these areas for uh Parks related purposes on

1:10:13

the surface and access to the Shoreline um they they can change at a

1:10:21

moment's notice if the city needs to go in to do infrastructure work that's you

1:10:28

know sometimes that those are things that need to happen quickly uh to get into the ground and make repairs or do

1:10:35

Replacements um it's there are things that need to happen and whatever is on

1:10:42

the surface uh can often disappear in in a very short amount of time not that it

1:10:48

won't be replaced but um the city and you know I think public work Parks uh

1:10:54

and Parks division staff will be able to speak to this in Greater detail at your February 8th joint session with the

1:11:01

parks and rec commission um but um that's the reason why those

1:11:08

Street ends were not included in the park zone proposal so I'll just leave it at that for the moment and again um I'm

1:11:15

sure that can get picked up on February 8th in your joint session the second thing um just back to uh I think it was

1:11:22

the last question there before I tried a few times there to come on screen um the

1:11:30

city hall uh question about mercerdale Park um uh Adam answered the question

1:11:36

yes uh from a permitted use perspective that was correct uh keep in mind um the

1:11:43

impervious surface uh Provisions that are in uh the draft that's in front of

1:11:49

you um would likely not permit a facility like that to go into that type

1:11:55

of part um when you're dealing with the Nonet uh provision you'd have to remove

1:12:02

a lot of impervious surface and which may not even be possible to to build that type of facility provide parking

1:12:08

for it and so forth so I just wanted to note that for the

1:12:13

record and thanks for letting me interrupt G

1:12:22

one I have some miscellaneous uh questions to ask about the exhibit one um on page

1:12:33

three where you have uses permitted listed

1:12:38

um I presume if we wanted to talk about government offices and

1:12:44

parking um it it seems like some of these features are being proposed to

1:12:51

be at a certain level because of things were concerned would become non-conforming if we didn't allow at

1:12:58

that standard so I presume the tiered approach would allow for saying

1:13:04

something different in one tier and then um having a less impactful use in some

1:13:10

of the other Parks right correct the tiered approach would allow that you know okay I'm I'm sort of

1:13:18

thinking that I've heard enough interest in the tiered approach that it might be helpful

1:13:23

for our next meeting to to see a a draft of that I think you know there's just

1:13:30

these obvious differences between Luther Burbank and the other parks that you know we could allow more

1:13:37

impactful well I mean I'm not looking to allow more of what's in Luther Burbank

1:13:43

in Luther Burbank but I'm concerned about seeing those not become nonconforming and the hassles that would

1:13:50

come from that so I do think the tiered approach might be quite useful and if we could see a draft of that uh it might be

1:13:57

might be helpful um parking government offices

1:14:02

and buildings come into question for that type of discussion um so another question I have on page

1:14:10

three is setbacks says that zero feet if the adjacent property is one of several

1:14:16

zones does that mean that the building can be built right on the property line

1:14:22

and again can you give me an example of the type of building we would allow to be built right to the property

1:14:28

line correct the set there would be no setback uh to the property line in that

1:14:34

area so uh for example if you had um if you were building like a restroom um in

1:14:42

and the land were adjacent to one of those zones the that restroom would be

1:14:47

would not be required to be set back from that property line um

1:14:54

all the other standards would apply little hard to uh understand the feasibility of that but I will think

1:15:00

about it um okay maximum Building height on page four um saying that no building shall

1:15:08

exceed 35 and flag poles antennas etc etc do not count toward Building height

1:15:14

in the Parks Zone the way that

1:15:20

was well Carolyn I lost your audio oh oh

1:15:26

dear well I'll try again do you hear me now yeah oh okay I am getting a weird

1:15:32

message here you you still hear me yes okay I'll try again um the way the

1:15:38

maximum Building height a provision is stated it sounds like the flag poles

1:15:44

antennas chimneys Etc that you're saying would not count toward Building height in the park zone

1:15:51

Zone do count elsewhere is that correct and why the difference that this would

1:15:57

only apply in the park zone and and why is that proposed is it com of that non-conforming issue again maybe yeah

1:16:05

and it's a standard exemption to allow those kinds of apperences um on to not

1:16:11

count toward the building height so um it I often a flag pole would be ex

1:16:19

excluded from the building height calculation okay but say um rooftop

1:16:24

apperences mechanical equipment chimneys and stuff those things do count toward

1:16:30

Building height like in residential right in some yeah yeah and and we could if if

1:16:38

the Planning Commission would like to amend that you could count you could

1:16:43

count the rooftop apperences toward that um or mechanical equipment if if you're concerned about that as part of I don't

1:16:50

I don't have a an idea to amend then I'm just trying to understand it but in commercial areas those things don't

1:16:57

count toward Building height is that kind of the way it works in some of our zones they do I believe but I don't have

1:17:04

them all memorized yeah okay okay thank you uh let's see

1:17:10

here okay and then regarding impervious surface it kind of seems and I I don't

1:17:16

quite understand this yet it kind of seems like we're trying to use impervious surface as a
DE velopment

1:17:23

control and while I fully understand the impacts of impervious surface on natural systems
and parks and so on I'm kind of

1:17:31

wondering it seems like a pretty convoluted way to decide what we want to allow in our
Parks why why is this

1:17:38

approach being pursued um so we proposed um or this

1:17:45

this standard was proposed as um for something to consider as one of the

1:17:51

alter or as an alternative or as an option um because there is some concern

1:17:57

about expansion of or we've heard some concern about expansion of impervious surface
um certainly there are other

1:18:04

options that we could do to control or use to control development um maximum

1:18:10

developable area or gross floor area like we use in the residential Zone um

1:18:16

this is a standard that's designed to reduce impervious surface not necessarily or address
impervious

1:18:22

surface not control um overall development a side effect of saying no

1:18:28

net new impervious surface is that that would then control how much development is possible yeah okay Carn let me

1:18:36

interrupt you you've had a few and looks like Adam has a question and let him

1:18:41

jump in and then I'll come back to you sure thank you um I guess yeah following

1:18:47

up on uh commissioner batsman's question on maximum Building height um we have

1:18:53

all of these exceptions um could we just say

1:18:59

you know the existing building in existing buildings in Luther Burbank Park are

1:19:05

Exempted um from whatever height limit we

1:19:11

select well it would depend we probably would need to word it differently than

1:19:17

that um okay we could I mean that that General theme instead of it high which

1:19:24

can allow a lot of new stuff let's just keep it nice and low and say existing

1:19:30

stuff is excluded from this limit would that solve the non-conforming issue we

1:19:37

could we could look at that I think if that's the direction that the Planning Commission wants to go um at our next um

1:19:44

our next meeting in February um you can provide that input and then we could develop an alternative for you to

1:19:50

consider um in the second draft

1:19:55

uh Angie thanks um I have a question

1:20:02

that'll sound a little bit like a squirrel or a parking lot but I want to bring it up because I think it's going to keep coming up um there have been

1:20:10

some comments about tree canopy in urban forestry um it came up here in Parks

1:20:17

context it came up in our Economic Development conversation and I think it's going to keep coming up until it

1:20:24

finds a home or we have something that's developed that people recognize as a nod

1:20:31

to kind of an urban forestry plan for Mercer Island if you will um so I do

1:20:37

want to put a plug in to you Adam and Allison about I I think we should loop

1:20:42

back on that um and figure out where that is or where that's going to live in this comprehensive Plan update um

1:20:49

because I know it's important to Residents and some of the Commissioners and I feel like we need to find a home

1:20:56

for it I'm not sure if it's here like I think there's um I when we have an

1:21:03

intention or a purpose for a park zone to um God what was the language that we

1:21:09

used around natural spaces like I think that that talks about Environmental

1:21:14

Management and natural Space Management but I do think there's this still this overall thread that I've heard in the

1:21:20

conversations over months about how do we as a city and as a

1:21:26

community uh manage our Urban Forest so I'm just going to make that plug for you because I'd like to figure out

1:21:32

explicitly where how that's going to live

1:21:38

someplace RIS yeah I'm sort of in a bit of a dilemma I think just going into this I'm

1:21:44

I'm not quite philosophically I'm feel like I'm a park protection maximalist and project by project I would be sort

1:21:51

of inclined not to do a project but I also feel like I'm not comfortable with

1:21:56

us from here planning for the future for city parks the city owns this property

1:22:03

um I have to have some faith in the future design process and between the complexity that will be induced by

1:22:10

trying to figure out what happens whether it's Building height or whether it's the the grid for all the different

1:22:16

Parks you know I'm I'm sort of drawn a little bit to the the I think the staff

1:22:21

proposal that you know let's have a a pretty broad template at the zoning level recognizing that a lot of these

1:22:28

battles will be fought out at the design level um but you know I'm I'm learning so uh I'm openminded but I think I just

1:22:34

wanted to I think that tension is there to some extent and I just wanted to flag

1:22:42

it Adam um I guess I'll respond to commissioner bazo and commissioner gs's

1:22:49

previous comments I think I I I agree with commissioner bazo and previously

1:22:54

commissioner accuse and I think I've already submitted a written comment um

1:23:00

yeah I'd love to see something talking about maintain or expand tree canopy um in this new zone so yeah that you got a

1:23:07

third vote there um if we if someone puts forth a motion um as regards

1:23:13

commissioner gs's comments I'm I would be very reluctant to um I don't know if

1:23:20

it's necessarily trusting the city but you know we start putting something

1:23:26

in here saying underground parking garage or multistory parking garage and

1:23:32

you know if I put a developer hat on I see oh wow they've just laid out a nice

1:23:37

little profit opportunity for me um on public land so I think it goes a little Beyond just trusting the city um

1:23:45

if we list something here that could Inspire new projects um so whether we

1:23:51

talk I later today or in our next two meetings on this I'm going to be throwing some suggestions out to trim a

1:23:58

lot of those um permitted uses including uh those

1:24:04

Park Victor uh plus one to Adam a response to

1:24:11

commissioner Gils well well I think the trust in the city's admirable if you

1:24:17

look down at the participants in the zoom meeting you'll see that we have one of the highest participation rate in our

1:24:23

uh Planning Commission meeting that I've seen since I've been here um a lot of people are interested in this and the

1:24:29

reason that there's a lot of people that are interested in it is that there is a long 50-year history of the city

1:24:34

encroaching on our parks and unfortunately

1:24:40

um while I would love to give the city the benefit of the doubt uh I don't

1:24:47

trust them to do that and I'd like to put gells around this uh pretty um uh

1:24:54

pretty strictly uh so that we can preserve our Parks um Carolin I'm going to come back

1:25:01

to you but uh before we do that I have kind of a related question to the

1:25:07

discussion we've had here that ties back to the impervious surface uh

1:25:13

discussion uh and and uh Jeff's comments um it says no net new impervious surface

1:25:22

is permitted unless it has been authorized by an adopted Park master

1:25:28

plan the city of Mercer Island Ed plan or specifically Exempted by this section

1:25:34

I'm curious about what constitutes authorized by an

1:25:39

adopted Park master plan um you know is that something that the

1:25:47

city council for example could decide that they're going to do a master plan for mercerdale Park including a new city

1:25:55

hall and thereby exempt the impervious surface uh limitation that Jeff said

1:26:01

would be a barrier to that so the city council does have the

1:26:10

authority to adopt Park Master plans um and can adopt a a master plan um I see

1:26:16

Jeff just jumped on the um jumped on the call here so maybe I'll defer to him if

1:26:22

he wants to respond yeah that'd be great yeah well I felt obligated given that I

1:26:27

was the one that brought it up so um chair Murphy um there I I don't I

1:26:34

believe there's only a few Parks Master plans that have been formally adopted by

1:26:39

city council um the your your theoretical

1:26:45

question I could perhaps come to fruition if the

1:26:51

council was to do a master plan for a specific Park and um decided to put X Y

1:26:58

or Z within the park so um so yeah so your yes is the answer to that question

1:27:05

that you asked um a Parks master plan uh

1:27:11

is it's a fairly extensive process uh including public participation um

1:27:18

Council Parks Commission and so forth so yeah yes it could theoretically happen

1:27:24

is the answer to your [Music]

1:27:30

question Carn um it's been my understanding

1:27:37

before and I'm a little surprised to hear it that even the open space Conservancy can be reversed by the

1:27:43

council isn't that correct the open space Conservancy trust

1:27:48

was created by the city council um yes and it can be uncreated right I mean it

1:27:54

doesn't provide permanent protection for those lands doesn't it does it I just want I mean I'm I'm not complaining I'm

1:28:01

just want to understand the reality of the situation I think um that's a good

1:28:07

question uh not one that I have an absolute answer for you yes or no on that's something I think we would want

1:28:13

to fact check and we can certainly come back to the commission with that answer thank

1:28:21

you

1:28:28

okay any other questions before uh Adam Zach moves on to the next part

1:28:34

of his oh Carolyn yeah I've got some more questions uh okay okay about

1:28:40

exhibit one um under lighting Zach um has uh color or lumens been considered

1:28:48

in the lighting considerations that are allowed in parks

1:28:54

uh it is not included in uh the current draft um except for lighting below 200

1:29:02

lumens is is allowed um provided it's lighting a pathway right okay okay um

1:29:10

and then you it says here lighting required by state or federal law what kind of lighting would the the

1:29:15

government be requiring that regard well so that would that would be for like uh typically that's for like safety so or

1:29:22

if um if they were working on a um like

1:29:28

a a project that like a federally funded project that had to have some kind of

1:29:34

lighting um those those types of uh those types of lighting yeah okay just

1:29:39

project oriented stuff then okay um I want to ask about the definitions of farmers market so I think um right now

1:29:49

our Farmers Market takes place in a street but this definition would have it I

1:29:56

guess being allowed in Parks so that's kind of a chain from the status quo do I

1:30:01

understand that correctly uh correct this is this is specifically to allow farmers markets in

1:30:07

the Parks okay um and then on definitions of Park

1:30:13

and recreational uses I just want to comment that I think the word environmental is kind of vague to be

1:30:20

used to describe a use so I kind of put my head to that a little bit and see if I can suggest a different term for

1:30:29

that and then last on um definition of temporary

1:30:35

structures so what would be an example of a temporary use that would go on as

1:30:41

long as 180 days in your view um that could be something like um

1:30:47

I don't know uh uh like Farm stands um we wouldn't have those in Mercer Island

1:30:53

but like a Farm Stand is sometimes a temporary use that happens through the the growing season um for up to six

1:31:01

months um but typically 180 days is the point at which um in usually in the

1:31:08

building code where that would then become a permanent structure um okay so

1:31:13

that that's kind of The Benchmark used and then I also have a question about the land use map okay um

1:31:23

so I'm looking at the map and I'm looking at the key and trying to line up the colors and the places where the park

1:31:29

zone would be so I see that the park zone um well I can't line up the colors

1:31:35

is one thing but I see at the at the North End of Mercer Island North of 90 there's an area that is currently dark

1:31:42

gray and buff which is shown as park zone which

1:31:48

apparently is something else right now I guess could you explain what that that is sure

1:31:56

so on the current land use map um that is a combination of public facility and

1:32:04

single family um designation and that is the that parcel with the hashing is the

1:32:11

myc parcel um so on the land use map that wasn't included that was designated

1:32:16

as public facility it would go to park okay and then there's another one south of 90

1:32:23

East um that is currently multifam that is shown as Park what's that uh that is

1:32:32

the Gallagher Hill open space

1:32:39

okay okay thank you Adam um yeah I'll I'll second

1:32:47

commissioner Bozman on some of the colors I I have some some had some difficult ulty there like um yeah

1:32:54

differentiating between open space and Commercial office on on that land use

1:33:00

map um and then I guess I'd like to rewind also to Farmers

1:33:06

Market um so you know I've been to the farmers market it's held on the street right now

1:33:13

um was there any public input or city council direction

1:33:19

to pave the way uh no pun intended for putting a farmers

1:33:25

market in the Parks presumably in mercerdale uh no it that that was

1:33:33

included as uh because we were talking about temporary uses being an allowed use um and it seemed reasonable to

1:33:40

assume that a farmer's market uh may take place in a park but again if the

1:33:45

Planning Commission would like to amend the draft to remove Farmers Market specifically uh we wouldn't even need to

1:33:51

then adopt a a definition for it okay yeah I just kind of was like wondering

1:33:57

where did that come from um so okay understanding understood

1:34:03

thanks caryn is that a new hand

1:34:10

or okay okay okay Adam Forge ahead with your

1:34:17

next yeah your presentation thanks um those are really

1:34:22

really great questions I'm looking forward to seeing what uh written questions come in next I think that'll be helpful for the group um as we move

1:34:30

forward here um let me share my screen I'll I'll put up the um Parks and

1:34:36

Recreation Commission comments I think we can get through these relatively quickly because we've already kind of

1:34:42

touched on a couple of the ideas here so um and again tonight we're we're

1:34:47

looking for um if there are those things that are are simple um that you feel

1:34:53

comfortable responding to tonight um we can we can do that by consensus or if we

1:34:59

want to hold off until um after the February 8th meeting we can do that as

1:35:04

well um I just want to kind of point point out again that we're we're shooting for getting this wrapped uh or

1:35:11

getting ready to um getting through this input um so that we can produce a second draft um

1:35:18

after this after this February 28th meeting um so um with that uh we'll look at the

1:35:26

first uh three comments uh from the PRC uh address the park zone um purpose

1:35:34

which is that first section of the new proposed park zone regulations um and these are

1:35:43

um probably one of the easier um these are it possibly a lower hanging fruit um

1:35:51

to decide on um basically differentiating this Zone from uh other zones by an

1:35:58

emphasis on Recreation um separating out number three from the other Concepts so

1:36:03

that would um be separating out kind of recreation from um some of the other um

1:36:10

things that go on in parks and strengthening that um the idea of um how

1:36:17

IT addresses recreation in the in the park zone purpose

1:36:24

um the fourth comment is uh to consider adding conditions to the recreational

1:36:30

uses or facilities to clarify what constitutes that use and then possibly

1:36:36

dropping private from the definition of recreational facilities um so those marn

1:36:41

do you have a question I don't know I'm sort of

1:36:46

thinking that this time maybe we should make it clear that we should talk as we go because otherwise it sounds like

1:36:52

Adam's going to run through the whole thing and then we're going to double back so how about we deal with number one two and three before we go into

1:36:58

number four that sound that would work for me okay all right any objection to

1:37:07

that Angie uh I just want to understand when you say let's deal with it is by

1:37:14

that do you just mean we're having a dialogue and discussion now because my understanding coming into the meeting

1:37:19

was we're not going to vote on any we're just going to have a dialogue and discuss yeah I'm talking about dialogue

1:37:25

and discuss like I'd like to try to understand number one better for example while we're on it and uh you know have a

1:37:32

comment about number three and so on so I think it would be useful to kind of do instead of you know coming back later

1:37:37

that's all I mean okay Chris yeah I actually like the idea of

1:37:45

differentiating the Zone by saying something to the effect that Recreation is the Paramount use of the park Zone

1:37:51

you know something from my point of view that if there's design decisions made in the future there'll be a standard of

1:37:57

which to hold it and is said it is it really you know forwarding the purpose of the Zone which is which is Recreation

1:38:03

but I you know I think there's something about just having Recreation listed first that doesn't seem inadequate for

1:38:09

the for the importance of the recreational use in in the context of the park

1:38:14

zone Andy do you have further comment or is that an old hand no I I think I would

1:38:21

just weigh in and indicate that um there's a longstanding history

1:38:28

in the United States as it relates to public space and Land Management about the distinctions between when we are

1:38:36

managing lands for the conservation of something and when we're managing lands for the recreation of something and I

1:38:43

think it does make a pretty big distinction for us that I would like to have a conversation with the parks group

1:38:48

about because they seem pretty bent on based on on their comments emphasizing

1:38:54

Recreation um and I do wonder about those times and situations when we have a park that's a park but its emphasis

1:39:02

isn't on Recreation as the lead um and so I'm you know maybe that's for a

1:39:09

tiered conversation but I think I am flagging that as uh wait a minute I

1:39:14

don't think it's always for recreation and Recreation does get in conflict with

1:39:20

other reasonable Park Land Management strategies

1:39:29

Victor I'll just uh give a plus one to commissioner bazo's comments um again I

1:39:37

I think that I'm not I I don't think we're going to solve it here but I I do think that it it begs for at least an

1:39:44

exploration of of the tiered approach because certainly what you can do in Lu rer bank is certainly much different

1:39:50

than what you can do in our smaller parks and it's not a one- siiz fits-all okay uh my slight Nuance on that is

1:39:59

that if we have any properties that were purchased with special bonds or whatnot

1:40:05

we're going to have large tracks of land that have restrictions like you can't have recreation use or you must allow

1:40:12

Recreation uses so we're going to need an analysis um from staff on any um

1:40:22

conditions that are attached to the Deeds on our Land Based on where the funding for purchasing that land came

1:40:29

from so I I guess by saying that I'm saying I don't see how we do this without a tiered approach that reflects

1:40:36

um the requirements of the titles of that are you know bound to the titles of the

1:40:42

properties based on funding

1:40:49

Carn um not entirely sure what they're getting at it number one to I to clarify

1:40:56

that active and passive Recreation are included but I guess these comments they're making are basically towards

1:41:03

what's written in our draft so when I look at our draft I mean I it possibly

1:41:08

can be approved but the only thing I see here that they mention in number one two

1:41:15

and three is to maybe separate out Recreation and make that you know A4 or

1:41:22

something they seem to want to not have it included with Urban Forest critical

1:41:28

habitat environmental resources and that could make some sense it might make the the regulations you know more clear but

1:41:34

I don't agree with their emphasis um let's see cons well differ

1:41:44

between I I don't agree with the idea of emphasizing Recreation for the parked Zone I I don't think that's really

1:41:50

correct at all so um okay so I think we can improve the language of the code I

1:41:56

don't agree with their emphasis greater emphasis on

1:42:03

Recreation Kate do you have another question or comment okay

1:42:10

Angie um I do have a comment but I want to ask a question of Adam real quickly

1:42:16

Adam if I wanted to can I rent space at a park to get

1:42:22

married good question um that would be a good question for the parks staff um at

1:42:29

on February 8 I don't know the answer off the top of my head okay because typically something is allowed in some

1:42:36

form or another it just depends it's the park the jurisdiction yada yada however if I'm allowed to get married at Luther

1:42:42

Burbank Park and I pay a fee to use the park consistent with park rules

1:42:48

oftentimes they let us to put up things like tents that are temporary in nature but it

1:42:53

allows me to cover my wedding that would be private in nature and oftentimes when

1:42:59

Park codes or whatnot re um refer to

1:43:04

private uh stuff in Parks it means that temporary private use nature like I set

1:43:10

up a tent in a park to have a wedding and I'll take it down tomorrow but not everyone is invited so I'm flagging that

1:43:17

in number four as uh the way it's written I'm not sure I would be inclined

1:43:23

to eliminate it because it's allowing for that kind of use if you will so I'm

1:43:28

just making that

1:43:34

comment

1:43:40

RIS yeah you I take Angie's point about the uh conservation being important in

1:43:46

parks and you know now I noticed that it's not listed under ited uses and is that because it's sort of the default is

1:43:54

that sort of lack of use is what the conservation you know uses I don't I

1:44:00

guess that was my question yeah I mean it's uh we'll we'll

1:44:06

get to I think it's number five here um no it's further down but uh one of their

1:44:13

comments was that we could add in a use that kind of addresses that um to more

1:44:19

be more affirmative but yeah I mean generally a passive use of the

1:44:25

land doesn't of use is conservation

1:44:30

right carilyn um regard following up on that you know I was thinking about the

1:44:35

same thing earlier but I was kind of understanding this code to be about development
what's allowed that is

1:44:42

development rather than defining all the different things we might do in Parks so

1:44:47

I I don't know if I'm uncomfortable with the you know the the gist of it the way it is you're
talking about number four

1:44:55

here from PRC don't understand what they mean when they say possibly drop private from
the

1:45:01

definition of recreational facilities um oh oh I see it does it does say

1:45:09

private okay I was I was hadn't found that before um never mind on that

1:45:16

one okay before we move on we've been going for almost two hours so let's take

1:45:22

a 10-minute break and uh then resume with uh page two of

1:45:30

exhibit

1:45:49

4

1:56:59

okay Adam are you ready to resume um Carolyn is that a hand up or

1:57:05

not oh no okay thanks all right we'll

1:57:11

pick up where we left off is dead de is here okay never fear

1:57:28

okay so picking back up at uh PRC input uh log number five um this is page two

1:57:35

of exhibit 4 um I think I can just we'll just use

1:57:42

this to keep track of I don't need to give a a summary if if you've already had a chance to read it yeah uh

1:57:52

Adam I'd I mean I'd like to see this trimmed down significantly to read

1:57:58

something to the tune of existing or pre-existing city services um I think we're open in the

1:58:05

door for way too much here as currently

1:58:12

worded Victor I'll go further um I'd like to

1:58:19

see the section eliminated um I acknowledge that there

1:58:24

are government buildings in uh Luther

1:58:29

Burbank um those predate the park uh those have been there well before it was

1:58:36

ever a park uh but I think uh the public would like an uh would like some

1:58:42

assurances that um there will be no additional government buildings and I'll

1:58:50

say that uh both Adam's response as well as Jeff's response to my question about

1:58:57

city hall in mercerdale Park wasn't exactly reassuring

1:59:04

GN what is considered to be Services Adam government services are um what we

1:59:13

get my definition here sorry just a moment

1:59:22

here so let me share the definition with

1:59:32

you um so this is the definition this is the existing definition of government

1:59:37

services in 1916

1:59:48

010 okay well a lot of those things would

1:59:54

involve an office I guess or a building but some of them might not but in any

2:00:01

case this seems to be another aspect of our draft that might be trying to accommodate what's in Luther Burbank

2:00:07

Park so again um a tiered approach seems to be a way to deal with this suggestion

2:00:14

that they have which I think is you know it's in the right direction but maybe needs to be taken a little farther um

2:00:20

consistent with what some of the Commissioners have already

2:00:25

said eight yeah I'm just curious

2:00:32

about um as someone who's worked for a parks department um you know we we do have a
a

2:00:40

very demanding community and we do have need of Maintenance facilities um we also know that the

2:00:48

needs can change over time and uses can change over time um preferred activities

2:00:54

can change over time so while I appreciate the spirit of not wanting to have like giant new

2:01:00

institutional buildings on Parks I'm wondering if maybe it's not a definitions issue because I would not

2:01:07

want to provide needed maintenance facilities

2:01:13

um from parks that just seems a little um over the top to me um but I wonder if

2:01:20

there's a splitting or or a way to say

2:01:26

um you know parks of a certain size can have maintenance facilities I I I I feel

2:01:32

like the city doesn't want to give up too much of its right to be able to do its job um but again understanding they need

2:01:39

to not want to have massive buildings a good idea I think there's also a um a question of where where

2:01:48

those May not be appropriate and and perhaps the tiered approach could address that

2:01:56

um thinking of like mercerdale Park and

2:02:01

the um the Whatchamacallit uh the farmers market you know they need

2:02:09

storage facilities for that they need to place to park um maintenance vehicles

2:02:15

for that they need to they need to be able to bring taable and other garbage

2:02:20

cans and things in and out for that activity um so there might be a handful of parks where we say m facilities um

2:02:27

storage facilities are allowed

2:02:34

Andie um I think I'm going to say something that's going to be very unpopular with many but I'm gonna say it

2:02:41

um I agree with Kate uh in the need to I

2:02:47

feel like we need to make sure the city can do its job um I have heard a lot of

2:02:53

sentiment both written in comments and certainly on this Planning Commission about a lack of trust in the city to do

2:03:00

its job which I think probably needs some kind of resolution in and of itself

2:03:05

but if I'm not doing my job as a commissioner to help outfit the city with the resources they need to do their

2:03:10

job it makes it hard and and based on what I've been seeing over months and years of paying attention it's already a

2:03:17

hard job eliminating their ability to use the lands that they do have um to

2:03:25

manage or maintain those spaces um like that that just makes a hard job already

2:03:30

harder I've been sitting on this commission long enough to hear people talk about the lack of space the lack of

2:03:36

parking the lack of places to do the things we need to do and I think that if we continue to narrow down and drill

2:03:43

down into that we're just not going to have any room to move around and it's going to come to a more painful head

2:03:50

that said I recognize that compromise like I've heard the fight that clearly has

2:03:56

been going on for time uh to make sure that we have good Park spaces and that

2:04:01

there is access to that um and I recognize the importance in of being able to balance maintenance and

2:04:08

preservation um but I'm just not willing to completely hamstring what seems like

2:04:14

an already very hamstrung City and you know ditto that for the

2:04:20

parking piece actually I there's some places about like no we can't make more parking where I'm like no we have to get

2:04:26

creative about parking like I'm really going to press us on we're going to need to get creative about parking and creating and managing and maintaining

2:04:33

and um and so I'm disinclined to take things off the table that might actually

2:04:38

be uh interesting and Innovative um and so I'm just I'm just going to let you

2:04:43

know that that's for discussion since we're discussing and debating

2:04:51

Victor just a clarification so my my comment was around the elimination of this section not the elimination of

2:04:57

government buildings I acknowledge that there are buildings a lot of government buildings that need to remain and serve a useful

2:05:04

purpose in in Luther Burbank and I would expect those to remain uh but I view

2:05:10

this uh this section as being uh additive to what's already

2:05:15

there and that's the portion that I don't support

2:05:24

okay um just acknowledging that I I feel like I need to after this discussion

2:05:29

reread and do a much deeper dive um to to form comments um I think there's a

2:05:38

lot of nuance to this and also I'm sorry if this is like

2:05:43

really way too specific but um I'm thinking of like the dog wash at marrymore Park and how much money that

2:05:50

makes and what an amazing and wonderful service that is and how much how many people own dogs on mercar island and how

2:05:57

thrilled we'd be to have something like that locally um I just wanted to like put that be in people's bonnets that

2:06:03

there are some and whether or not you think that's a good idea like there are

2:06:10

some amenities that are Enterprise amenities that that Parks can have that we don't currently have that can make us

2:06:16

money to help fund our parks um that don't have massive impacts but

2:06:22

um have huge benefits to the community so I I know like I I so much want to

2:06:30

um have more trees and I want to protect um protecting so massive

2:06:36

buildings don't get placed on them but I I don't want us to lose the ability

2:06:42

to think creatively about Enterprise and new uses things that things that can be useful to us let's not be so like jaded

2:06:51

about past decisions that we through out throughout any opportunity for

2:06:59

Innovation there's a balance I guess is what my comment is yes I think the other point to add to

2:07:06

that is that we don't know what might be something people perceive as useful or

2:07:13

necessary uh 20 years from now so that flexibility is

2:07:19

is important um and not to be overly restrictive um you know I think there's

2:07:26

a consensus I'm hearing of the group with we're very concerned about kind of

2:07:34

the big issues uh and the big things that might be done

2:07:39

wrong but I think there may be a sentiment that there needs to be flexibility to do not just small things

2:07:48

but but some things that provide better access Etc uh and so we so that may be another

2:07:57

way to be thinking about these issues um along with the tiered approach discussed

2:08:03

earlier uh Adam I'm uh like I I've heard it now

2:08:09

twice and I'm quite concerned by this theme of trying to monetize our Parks I

2:08:16

mean that that's what bonds are for right the that's millions of dollars um I'm I just that that sounds

2:08:24

like just such a a ludicrous idea um you know I've seen it done but I

2:08:32

mean monetizing purely to fund I mean yes say your point of

2:08:41

order um we're we're not meant to insult each other's ideas with terms like

2:08:46

ludicrous that's just a point of order chair I think that's well taken Adam you

2:08:51

want to rephrase that I am strongly against any ideas of

2:08:58

trying to monetize our Parks uh the purpose my understanding of this zone is

2:09:05

to protect and preserve the parks not to try to fill very small gaps

2:09:13

in um a budget we we're not here to

2:09:19

balance budgets and yeah apologies for the strong emotions on protecting our

2:09:32

Parks here um I

2:09:38

also would not want to see um the use of parks to make money

2:09:46

but I can see possibly some commercial uses for

2:09:51

example um small craft you know that could be rented that might be a contract

2:09:57

with a commercial operator or you know the concessions idea I'm not quite sure about that
but that's those are two

2:10:04

different ways of considering um you know commercial activities or or money-making activities

2:10:11

in the park but I have a comment about number six but I'll I'll wait on

2:10:16

that um Adam uh Zach I have a question for you on this uh issue of money um you

2:10:24

know I assume that uh the baseball leagues and others pay for the use of

2:10:30

the park system uh do we have any handle on what that amounts to and

2:10:38

kind of what rough roughly what the scope of that is and who pays and where that money

2:10:44

goes um I I don't have that information ready um at the moment but that uh on the 8th

2:10:52

during the parks and rec Commission meeting that would be a great question to ask our Park staff um and then if we

2:10:58

if that question's still hanging out we can address it in the February packet okay

2:11:08

thanks okay Forge ahead okay so that was number five I

2:11:14

think we're on to number six here

2:11:21

okay uh I think I saw Victor's

2:11:26

first so I think there was a comment in the PRC about uh that I don't see captured

2:11:33

here about uh changing the language here um to

2:11:39

be surface or street parking um the idea of underground

2:11:46

parking or parking structures in our Parks um

2:11:52

is offensive it's even more offensive given the fact that we're

2:11:58

trying desperately to eliminate parking in our account Center and with every development we eliminate parking but for

2:12:05

some reason we we seem to want to increase parking here uh so I would advocate for changing this and being

2:12:12

very explicit about uh surface of street parking which I think was good feedback from the PC

2:12:22

Carn um I wanted to see if I could get at what they were trying to suggest here so um consider revising public parking

2:12:30

to Simply state public parking I think that's supposed to say consider revising e parking to p and they want to

2:12:39

change that to public parking do you think that's what they mean Adam um I I think that that's yeah that

2:12:46

was a typo I think here so they want to change all of section e to public

2:12:51

parking and um I mean I seems like a reasonably good

2:12:58

idea uh well public parking yeah um maybe

2:13:04

they're trying to are they concerned about that the city would somehow rent out parking spaces to

2:13:10

people or something what what did what prompted this suggestion here do you

2:13:16

know um I don't know that would be a good question to ask the PRC at the Joint meeting on the 8th okay and then

2:13:23

the other thing they say to link it with recreational uses so I guess they're

2:13:31

saying um I'm trying to think of uses of our parking areas and parks that would

2:13:37

not be recreational and somebody Park their car there and go to work or um

2:13:42

what I I just don't understand what they're getting at here you know

2:13:49

well there's there's a couple of uh again I I'm not going to speak for the PRC but there there are some ways that

2:13:56

you could get at um keeping parking uh limited to those things with

2:14:04

recre or being accessory to recreational uses or an allowed use would be another

2:14:10

option so we could we could look at those in the next draft but I think you can get more clarification on the eth and then then

2:14:18

when they say Recreation then that starts bringing in again the narrowness of the word recreation in terms of you

2:14:24

know what what goes on in Parks but um I'm not uncomfortable with using the

2:14:29

same definition for parking that's used in the rest of the city it'd be pretty

2:14:34

rare that we would ever have any underground parking but I don't think we need a separate definition for the parks

2:14:42

that would be my thought on that Adam um yeah I I'm in support of the I

2:14:51

think it per my written comments the like at grade or street level um and

2:14:57

directly supporting Park use to prevent any pressure or ideas to add parking you

2:15:05

know to supplement Town Center or to support a park and ride um so

2:15:14

yeah Chris it's interesting you know I was thinking surface parking should be

2:15:20

uh you know as as Adam just described uh Park use related but I you know I'm sort

2:15:26

of more open in my mind to underground parking even more broadly if you know if we needed it for some reason or another

2:15:32

and I'm sort of curious what uh why is that such a off limits other is it philosophic or is there some practical

2:15:39

problem in terms of let take mercerdale using mercad Dale if there was an entrance that went underground and

2:15:45

people parked under there uh

2:15:54

Victor Adam you have any thoughts on that responding to Chris I I'm I'm happy to respond I

2:16:02

I'll again say what I've said in previous meetings uh parks are the third rail of Mercer

2:16:09

Island politics underground parking at mercerdale or anywhere else involves getting a bulldozer and digging deep uh

2:16:18

and and and changing changing that Park significantly uh my contacts and and

2:16:26

kind of my ear to the ground on this as well as my own feeling is people are

2:16:31

uninterested in that

2:16:38

Andie uh I think there's a couple of different camps I think there are definitely people not interested in that

2:16:45

and and I do think there are people who are you know I've had conversations with folks who are like well you know it'd be

2:16:51

great if we could do something even more active or even more like there's a lot

2:16:56

of creative ideas out there and I actually you know Victor steinbrook Park in Seattle is a park on top of a parking

2:17:03

garage um it actually makes that parking garage not nearly as abominable because

2:17:11

we got something cool on top of it adjacent to Pipe Place Market uh given that town center is continually

2:17:17

constricted just making sure we don't limit ourselves I think you can put a big field back on top of something I think

2:17:24

it's a possibility and I think it's important to leave some possibilities open for conversation and discussion

2:17:31

even though I recognize that I probably just derailed the third rail in some way

2:17:36

um I think it's I think it's important to be able to continue to have the conversation so that we can all have

2:17:41

what we need and want and there's a lot of needs and wants and limited availability to meet that I like it I

2:17:50

like the idea in some ways of being able to have increased parking if I think about people's use of parking too like

2:17:57

and of parks like to increase capacity of a park to receive people and visitors

2:18:04

if we're having more use of it like where are we going to put people and still be able to access business or

2:18:11

access neighbors and neighborhoods without constricting that I think it's

2:18:16

going to require us um to get creative and

2:18:21

compromis uh okay um thank you chair um I I think

2:18:29

part of the parking issue has to be a discussion of ADA issues and um we don't

2:18:37

have adequate accessible parking in our park so I think we need to manage this one carefully um we don't have

2:18:45

accessible Parks generally a lot of our parks require um being able-bodied to

2:18:50

get into them and to use many of their facilities and functions um so I think

2:18:55

Ada issues are important here um I also want to you know for what Angie is

2:19:01

saying and just some earlier discussion about um Recreation and Enterprise if you look at our budget \$1.34 million of

2:19:10

the 2023 budget came from Recreation programs that is a significant amount of

2:19:16

the city budget total City budget is 34 million property taxes are 135 so our

2:19:22

Recreation programs are 10% of our property tax budget our business and

2:19:27

utility taxes are five million so Recreation programs are uh maybe just

2:19:33

over 20% relative to business and utility taxes that is not a small amount

2:19:38

of money in the city budget and um I just wanted to revisit that issue

2:19:44

everyone in this group is taking time out of their day because they care

2:19:50

about our city and because they're very passionate about parks and they're very passionate about the uses so I'm just

2:19:56

going to reiterate we need to talk about these things using um facts

2:20:02

acknowledging that this is a Hot Topic let's use facts um and and and really

2:20:09

just stick to that when we're talking about dollars and sense and park uses um there's a a ton of park space that is

2:20:17

used used for sports fields and that is a money generated Enterprise for our

2:20:24

city a significant one so let's get real let's use facts in these discussions um

2:20:30

it's going to get hot it's going to get heated um let's let's be kind about it

2:20:37

thanks Victor so uh partially in response

2:20:45

to Angie's Angie's comments um earlier you mentioned trust

2:20:53

and there's a huge trust issue here uh there's a 50-year trust issue here um

2:21:01

their Pioneer Park was supposed to be redeveloped as a golf course as I alluded to

2:21:07

earlier uh there was a proposal to put City Hall and the fire department in

2:21:13

mercerdale park uh there was going to be

2:21:18

Transit parking I believe on kite Hill uh more recently and more recently there

2:21:25

was also talk of a a thrift shop sorting Center within Midale

2:21:31

Park um there is a long history of breach of trust and encroachment on our

2:21:37

Parks um I would say fix the trust issue first and then we can talk

2:21:43

about uh being more flexible about our parks but right now people feel like art

2:21:49

parks are threatened which is actually the Genesis of this discussion and why

2:21:55

the city council asked staff to come up with a park zone which is they wanted

2:22:01

the parks

2:22:15

protected oh okay any further comments

2:22:22

Adam uh I like commissioner bazo's description of a parking garage uh where

2:22:28

she used the word

2:22:39

abominable so I think the next item that we're looking at is

2:22:45

seven the trans stops issue and I have a question for you Adam

2:22:51

Zach what's the difference between a bus stop and a Transit

2:22:58

stop uh there would be a semantic difference a bus stop is a Transit stop

2:23:03

so we could Define it differently if the Planning Commission wanted um but under

2:23:09

the current definition it would be a bus stop would be a Transit stop and isn't it the I think I appan

2:23:17

was probably correct uh in stating that most of the bus stops are in the right

2:23:23

way aren't they most of them are yes probably all existing ones but are

2:23:30

close to it yeah okay so what what's the purpose

2:23:38

of including this as a in

2:23:43

there well if there were something like if you you wanted to add a bus stop say

2:23:49

at the entrance to a community center or inside a park somewhere that's not in

2:23:56

the right of way this would allow it um

2:24:02

yeah uh Victor uh a comment and a question um so

2:24:10

can you tell me the difference between a Transit stop and a Transit

2:24:15

facility yeah yes a Transit stop is a single stop along fixed stop along a a

2:24:22

route um that doesn't include additional um

2:24:28

additional uh development so doesn't include uh parking or vehicle storage um

2:24:35

but in the current definitions a Transit stop would be a Transit facility but a

2:24:40

Transit facility is broader than Transit stop which is more specific and what's being proposed here a Transit facility

2:24:45

or a Transit stop Transit stop is the proposed use in the

2:24:51

draft so I'm I and it's cut off on the screen but a Transit facility it says a

2:24:57

Transit facility Transit facility located at selected points along Transit

2:25:03

routes for passenger pickup drop off or transfer but excluding areas for vehicle

2:25:08

repair or storage parking lots transfer stations and park and R

2:25:14

stations it sounds to me that a Transit facility is being proposed

2:25:20

here the proposed use in the draft is to allow a Transit

2:25:26

stop um but the words on the screen are Transit facility here I can show you the draft

2:25:33

maybe that'll help clear it up um let me pull that up

2:25:42

here and again as I'm pulling this up these are the types of things we can uh

2:25:47

amend the allowed uses um as the as the Planning Commission would like or see

2:25:54

fit so the uses permitted here is a Transit stop um that doesn't say Transit

2:26:01

facility um allowing those kind of bigger um facilities be limited and and

2:26:09

to chair Murphy's earlier comment those current there's not a

2:26:14

Transit stop in a par currently is that right to my knowledge no okay so I don't

2:26:20

actually understand why we have that section there and I'm not supported

2:26:32

of uh Alan um yeah I'll Echo uh commissioner

2:26:40

she's comment that I'm not supportive of that either I mean we have we have

2:26:47

referring back to my written comments we have Transit stops in single family

2:26:53

residential and multif family zones and those are not listed as allowed uses yet they still work presumably because

2:26:59

they're within the right away so let's let's let's keep let's keep the bus stops at within the right away um I yeah

2:27:09

I I can't put my name on anything saying putting that putting that in

2:27:15

apart uh Andy um in considering uh a number of

2:27:22

things including as we grow and as hopefully Transit becomes a bigger player in the

2:27:29

way humans move around and Transit is currently a major source of moving um

2:27:35

people with disabilities or those other than abled body including abled body

2:27:40

allowing for a Transit stop inside of a park does allow for Trans better Transit

2:27:46

access for those other than abled body um and it can in fact save money and

2:27:52

reduce our need to make our right of way um at more accessible which is one of

2:27:58

the challenges all jurisdictions have like how accessible are our public

2:28:03

spaces uh more and more you're going to feel and see the need to increase

2:28:08

accessibility for multiple people in public spaces and the ability to serve

2:28:13

Transit inside of a parking lot for example that has increased access for wheelchairs or
cane rails or whatnot um

2:28:23

Can can be and will be more important in the future that I think we might realize

2:28:31

he um I'm wondering if we get like a a thumbs up thumbs down

2:28:36

on uh a Transit item related to

2:28:42

accessibility or Ada meeting gaps in Ada as opposed to is this broad open-ended

2:28:47

Transit item um I'm just wondering what the um appetite is in the group for

2:28:54

supporting Ada issues um versus just a a

2:28:59

a blanket Transit statement because I think that's important I think a couple of other people have mentioned that it's important as well um so I I want to know

2:29:08

if there's an appetite for preserving that use for Transit facilities as opposed to a broad

2:29:15

one

2:29:22

not sure if I'm understanding that you want it thumbs up or thumbs down on I I don't

2:29:29

know yeah I don't know if you could phrase it like is uh would would would the commission be maybe the question

2:29:35

would be a a quick thumbs up thumbs down on whether the commission would be interested in exploring

2:29:44

uh you know some sort of compromise where we look at transit for Ada

2:29:50

purposes um as a starting point of a conversation as opposed to just broad

2:30:00

Transit but I think you have to ask for thumbs Michael I don't know if you're willing

2:30:08

um I think there was a reticence at the outset of this meeting to vote on things

2:30:16

um I understand your point and I think it's well made but I

2:30:21

don't um I think it's it's better to have planted that seed than necessarily

2:30:27

to get people to commit to it

2:30:33

Carolyn I think that the you know the Ada accessibility to Parks is a good

2:30:39

thing to consider while we're talking about this particular matter of Transit because that's how some people with uh

2:30:46

disabilities would get to go two parks there's different kinds of buses I think we maybe some of you are like me were

2:30:52

thinking about giant giant buses but there's also very small buses you know

2:30:57

that um I guess I think that comes under the definition of Transit too so by

2:31:04

saying no Transit it would seem that we would be placing some limitations on some Creative Solutions for some people

2:31:12

that need it um I noticed the PRC their point seems to be to change this to limiting Transit stops

2:31:20

to only temporary stops I don't think really that's the point as to whether it's temporary or not I think I think

2:31:26

the bigger issue is that we're talking about is you know whether to allow it at

2:31:31

all I'm kind of open to some form of it don't know quite how to put

2:31:38

it okay any further discussion on uh number seven Andy well I think the only

2:31:45

pitch I would also make is um as a parent who has kids in

2:31:51

sports um you know I do appreciate when my kids have more direct access to

2:31:56

Transit and can use it to get to and from now I know I'm sure there's lots of

2:32:02

folks who can bring up examples of kids not using public transit but you know I do think having public transit serve

2:32:10

places that people want to go and if parks are places that we want to go um

2:32:15

and it also helps address parking problems you know there's a there's a piece about I think Transit is important

2:32:22

component to Public Access um and I also think it helps take pressure off of some

2:32:27

other things I I don't support our Parks being stop over

2:32:33

layover uh maintenance facilities um I but I do think Parks get to be a place

2:32:39

that people have increased and better access to and to the extent that those things merge
um I think is important

2:32:49

y just add uh one final sense about access I'm thinking of like school kids

2:32:56

as well a lot of our Parks um access points are not designed for school buses

2:33:01

um and yeah appreciating not wanting to have giant layovers and whatnot um just

2:33:07

the ability to get kids in our school district on field trips into Parks it

2:33:12

really doesn't happen all that often because they are not accessible um yeah

2:33:17

just that's my two other two cents Victor just responding to commissioner

2:33:25

bazo's com comment I'm not I'm not arguing against

2:33:31

and and I think others aren't arguing against Transit um yeah I'm all for Transit yay

2:33:38

Transit Transit usually involves a bus either big or small as as commissioner

2:33:44

Bosman pointed out these things run on roads and that's where Transit stops are

2:33:50

they're on roads they're not in the Parks and that's that's what we're

2:33:56

arguing against here is Transit within the parks

2:34:02

themselves I don't think it belongs there and and with the exception of uh well with with no exception I I

2:34:10

can't I can't think of a park that doesn't have a road running in front of it so I'm I'm not I'm I'm not quite

2:34:18

sure I I'm not I'm not quite sure I follow the the transit argument Transit runs on Roads Transit

2:34:26

stops are on roads and public rways and P and all of those exist in in

2:34:31

front of our

2:34:37

parts yeah I think the point being made is not in all those Parks is access from

2:34:45

the road uh easy for disabled people or you know

2:34:52

or elderly or whatever but but that's a different point and I think that's a

2:34:57

point that Kate is making yes is an accessibility Point that's not a Transit

2:35:02

stop the language that we're talking about here is Transit stop there and and Kate rightly raised

2:35:10

there's an accessibility issue and that's a completely separate thing but that's not what we're discussing here

2:35:17

um yeah I believe they overlap um Victor because it's not either or uh in some

2:35:23

cases is either or but there are some that that that issue overlaps so I think

2:35:29

that's the point being made uh Carolyn well I was just thinking

2:35:35

that you know transit for disabled is probably custom small can just drive

2:35:42

into a park and drop somebody off they don't need a Transit stop for for that so you know maybe that's not

2:35:51

needed

2:35:57

okay my hand is not up I'll do the talk

2:36:02

okay okay any further discussion of Transit stops seeing none we'll move on to

2:36:10

signage number eight

2:36:17

Adam uh referring once again back to my written comments I mean I've seen

2:36:23

habitat restoration signs in our Parks um I like that I see those signs in

2:36:29

residential warning us about invasive knotweed yes um but when I go look at

2:36:34

the pi Zone um or when I look at residential zones I don't see signs um

2:36:40

so I fail to see why that should be included as a use in our Park

2:36:51

Zone Barn I want to ask Adam you know this makes me nervous when I remember when we

2:36:57

worked on the sign code a few years ago and how the federal law is requiring us

2:37:04

to be kind of more accommodating signs and I'm more concerned about people

2:37:12

being able to put up signs that are otherwise allowed on public property like advertising their

2:37:19

business or their political view or whatever so what how do how do those

2:37:26

type of signs relate to this use that is listed as being allowed in

2:37:32

parks there are some signs that the city has

2:37:38

um that there are limits in what the city can regulate in terms of signs because there are some signs that are

2:37:44

First Amendment protected speech um but I I can't get into the finer detail than

2:37:52

that um but you're right to bring up that um that point in terms of I can

2:37:57

speaking to that a little since I was the one that worked on the sign code previously um I believe our arcs code

2:38:05

the the code that operates um activities within Parks rather than land uses um

2:38:14

already uh limits signs in parks to those either placed by the city or those

2:38:23

um allowed as a part of a special event permit like for example when there's art

2:38:31

installations or more like free speech related signs um like say for like a

2:38:37

black lives matter event or something like that um they go through that special events permit process to do that

2:38:45

installation um and commercial signs or other

2:38:50

non-permitted signs are not allowed in Parks thanks so that's like in another

2:38:57

part of code aside from this it's in the sign code is that where you find that no it's

2:39:03

in the Parks code which I don't recall the exact

2:39:08

number we can we can let you know that um I believe it's title six I'll need to confirm okay

2:39:17

okay well maybe we could make sure that those two sections are in agreement or that at least we understand that they're

2:39:25

in agreement thank

2:39:33

you okay any other comments questions on

2:39:44

signage we on to number nine large Wireless Communications

2:39:53

facilities Adam um once again I would Advocate um

2:39:59

and I think shares yeah I I would agree with the PRC input here scratch this

2:40:06

from the list um by adding it we're encouraging and allowing large

2:40:14

wcfs1 19670 already permits small Wireless facilities in are well quote are

2:40:21

permitted in all zoning designations uh and I've seen it with utilities um you know these are I've

2:40:29

seen it as easements like you know those have value to companies and you build

2:40:34

one and then the next one comes along saying oh there's already um a wireless

2:40:39

communication facility so that's a justification to build another um so this is opening up Pandora's Box let's

2:40:46

not allow the large wcf's and we already allow the small ones um per you know by

2:40:53

law and per city code so I agree with log number nine let's remove

2:40:58

it Victor plus one to the vice chair's

2:41:05

comments and a question for Adam Zach

2:41:10

um do we have any large Wireless Communications facilities Parks

2:41:17

currently um and Alison you might be able to back we do

2:41:24

um I'm trying to recall the exact locations but I believe Island Crest

2:41:29

park has one and perhaps another location as well y

2:41:36

thanks gate yeah this's a question I'm

2:41:42

wondering if staff can share more about the origin this on the list um and one

2:41:47

of the reasons I'm asking is because um just watching the uh neighborhood

2:41:53

comments on next door and whatnot neighbors seem to be adamantly opposed to having these types of facilities in

2:41:59

residential areas um but there also seems to be a demand

2:42:05

to fill the gaps and uh you know phones drop out here and there so I feel like

2:42:11

there might be something going on here where residents are asking for things that AR in opposition to each other

2:42:17

which I'm sure City staff have never experienced before um like what why did staff propose this

2:42:25

and if it is a need and a demand from the residents to have better Wi-Fi

2:42:30

service what are the options for filling it um is it because I know that

2:42:36

residential is not desirable to a lot of of residents um so if not residential

2:42:42

and if not Parks what are we left with is it just commercial places and are those adequate to fill the gaps um in

2:42:50

coverage that residents are demanding so I'm just I'm wondering what is the origin of this statement um and if we

2:42:57

take it out of here where do those facilities that residents are demanding

2:43:03

live well so I on the first part of that question um this draft was prepared as a

2:43:10

way to um as kind of the starting point for this conversation with the Planning

2:43:16

Commission um and so as we were preparing the draft and we were reviewing it with other um City

2:43:23

departments and we had it go through legal review we wanted to get a starting point that was um a proposal that was

2:43:30

you know legally acceptable and then also um addressed some of those foreseen

2:43:36

things that may need to happen in parks with the with the recognition that this

2:43:42

was going to go through um this review process and a refinement process with um

2:43:48

with the Planning Commission um so that's that's where this draft kind of came from that was the perspective

2:43:54

within which It Was Written um it I think that that is that your question

2:44:00

about service areas and what kind of services may be provided I think is uh

2:44:05

one of the trade-offs that we'll have with most of these um uses is you know

2:44:11

if we don't Pro if we prohibit this use in a city park that then means that that

2:44:16

use would not be allowed there and so that's one less place that it may be allowed so I think that's part of the trade-off I can't necessarily answer

2:44:24

where um would be the appropriate place for it at at this moment but I hope that

2:44:31

helped Carolyn I admit to being possibly a little confused I thought we that the

2:44:39

wireless facilities have to be allowed in all of the zones in the city and that

2:44:44

that's the federal law and I thought I understood that it was both large and small Wireless

2:44:52

facilities am I correct in that Allison um do you because you sorry

2:45:01

yeah I we're going to have to consult with legal counsel for a definitive answer on this it is that is correct for

2:45:07

small Wireless facilities I don't know the law about the larger macro facilities as well so I will need to

2:45:14

consult with our Leal Council about that um for the for the small facilities we

2:45:20

have virtually no control over where they're placed it's all based on the needs of the carriers for coverage okay

2:45:28

so once we figure once we find that out and and find out you know what is actually required to be allowed in Parks

2:45:35

um then my next question is do we have to state that in this regulation in

2:45:41

order to be consistent I mean not that it makes a whole lot of difference but are we do we have to put it in this

2:45:48

list to be legal to be consistent again we should consult with legal counsel on that it may be possible

2:45:55

to remove it from this this list given that it's covered in another section of the code okay

2:46:04

thanks okay any further comments on questions on

2:46:10

wireless okay number 10 one does not appear to be very

2:46:20

controversial uses this any comments on 10 uh just need a

2:46:37

minute can you share a screen again on my phone for this call and it's a tiny

2:46:43

little I can't toggle between you all in

2:46:49

the sorry Kate were you asking me to stop sharing my

2:46:55

screen oh are you Shing I I just

2:47:01

see I I for some reason on my device I'm just seeing people not your screen

2:47:09

share now maybe I pushed the wrong button here okay got it thank you sorry

2:47:26

mhm Angie uh I think that this one is one I

2:47:32

I I mean I'll just say I'm looking forward to talking to the parks and W committee I

2:47:37

think when anybody as it relates to Land Management starts talking about uses um

2:47:45

we do tend to focus on like how are humans going to use the space or how are

2:47:51

we going to use the space and I scratch my head a little bit about you know if the space is managed for conservation

2:47:59

for example do you do is it really necessary to define those

2:48:06

conservation actions or activities within the use or is that considered consistent

2:48:12

with managing the space I mean we don't get hyper specific about

2:48:19

how Parks maintains their parks in the codes um like some of that

2:48:27

detail you know I think comes from the actual management of so I'm I am curious

2:48:32

about why we think we need to call out natural systems improvements in some ways it almost makes it sound like if we

2:48:39

have to call it out then it's more of a hobby than a purpose or it's more of a hobby than like that we're treating it

2:48:45

like it's some kind of recreational use as opposed to you know that needs definition as

2:48:50

opposed to recognizing a conservation purpose for the land so I I it's a

2:48:56

something I want to ask how or why they're looking at it that

2:49:02

way Marilyn yeah I have similar comments so

2:49:08

uh seems like the purpose of the regulations are to um you know identify

2:49:13

new zone different Define uh what the uses are that are allowed and then the development standards associated with

2:49:20

the uses so it seems like it's not about this is this it's about development so

2:49:27

I'm not quite sure why we need to Define what non-development is and if we did try to Define non-development we might

2:49:33

find ourselves a little bit hard coming up with a definition that accommodates all of the wonderful non-development

2:49:40

things that go on in natural areas so I'm not quite sure if it's needed but uh

2:49:48

yeah cuz it the conservation I don't consider a use you

2:49:53

know okay number 11 Building height we've

2:49:58

already touched on this a few times but um here it

2:50:06

is any additional thoughts or comments on

2:50:13

it Caroline I would like to uh talk to PRC about you

2:50:18

know the idea that we have or that maybe they had too about the Matrix you know kind of like if we're concerned about

2:50:26

maximum Building height and we're worried about things that are non-conforming you know having problems

2:50:33

in the future this is one of those things that we might address with a matrix of different standards for

2:50:39

different Parks we just see if the PRC is into that maybe they maybe they like that idea

2:50:46

bris yeah I I think I don't understand the problem with the non-conforming use

2:50:52

I mean if we had a you know a 20 foot 24 foot building height you know how how

2:50:57

does that create a problem with the existing uh buildings at uh at Luther

2:51:03

bearbank I mean why what I understood you to say is that simply that you know when when they come down they go up

2:51:09

smaller buildings go up instead of them I mean is that all there is to it or is it create some ongoing problem

2:51:16

um so when a when a use is non-conforming or a structure is non-conforming um just kind of generally

2:51:24

the code is designed to replace that non-conforming user structure with a

2:51:29

conforming user structure and where that gets into or where that can create

2:51:34

friction is in um improving those

2:51:41

existing non-conforming structures um so things things like if you needed to do

2:51:47

some kind of exterior work to for a seismic retrofit or something like that it could create it there is the

2:51:54

potential to create some friction because of the non-conforming code is kind of designed to constrain

2:52:01

non-conforming uses and non non-conforming structures um so that's

2:52:06

the in general you are you hesitate to create when you create a non-conformity

2:52:13

or when you make something non-conforming the idea is that that thing is going to go away eventually um

2:52:19

and so that's the the concern is that we don't want to be planning for existing

2:52:25

structures to kind of go away or change significantly that's that's the

2:52:31

implication of non-conformity

2:52:36

Victor is it possible to deal with non-conforming buildings through either

2:52:42

exception which I think somewhere somewhere in the documents that were sent out we we have a number of

2:52:47

exceptions that we call out um or just grandfather them in and just

2:52:55

call out that the fact that we acknowledge the fact that there are these buildings and and they're above uh

2:53:01

above the the maximum height limit there's there's a couple of yeah

2:53:06

there are a couple of different ways that you could get at that um you know the the tiered approach as well um that

2:53:13

has been talked about tonight would be another way that the Planning Commission could say in parks of this size with

2:53:20

these services that fit into this tier structures may be this this tall or yeah

2:53:28

or existing structures something like I would encourage us as we come up with a second draft of this to look at those

2:53:36

options because again this this seems like a very broad option that I think is

2:53:42

um unne necessary um especially since what we're trying to do is accommodate

2:53:48

existing buildings and so I think there's a number of ways that we can

2:53:54

address that issue whether it's grandfathering by by exception or you

2:53:59

know this tiered issue but rather than having a blanket statement that says hey we're going to allow buildings with a

2:54:05

maximum height of 36 feet or three stories in our Parks which include a lot

2:54:10

of smaller Parks um I think I think that's a more rational

2:54:17

approach Adam um I'll I'll Echo Victor's comments

2:54:23

there like I would I would lean towards yeah making exceptions for existing ones

2:54:29

I'm also a little confused by the verbal answer to the non-conforming like

2:54:34

I'm looking at 1901 050 on my other screen and you know it's titled non-conforming structures it says the

2:54:41

purpose of this section is to allow for the continuing and maintenance of Legally established non-conforming

2:54:47

structures not to drive them to be rebuilt and then looking at uh section

2:54:53

B1 I see ordinary repairs and maintenance of Legally non-conforming structure are permitted in no event May

2:55:00

any repair or maintenance result in the expansion of any existing non-conformity

2:55:06

or the creation of any new non-conformity so I read that as okay let's say we set the limit at

2:55:12

24t an existing building is 36 yeah it's non-conforming if we don't go the route

2:55:17

of accepting it now you can you can repair it you can fix it you can update it but you can't build it higher right

2:55:24

that would be the expansion of any existing non-conformity um so I'm a little

2:55:29

confused there um I'm just I'm just just

2:55:35

reading the code sounds like it's trying to keep them there and just prevent someone

2:55:40

from increasing the degree to which it is non-conforming not drive exist sorry Elson you want to

2:55:48

address that yeah I just wanted to comment on that I mean I think those Provisions could really limit the

2:55:54

ability to renovate buildings in the future like for example that Luther Burbank admin building is completely

2:56:02

non-accessible it does not have an elevator it does not have accessible bathrooms if the city wanted to add

2:56:08

those facilities at some point in the future it would likely require a small

2:56:14

expansion of the building like a bump out um which likely would be prohibited by this non-conforming

2:56:24

code Adam I think Point Alison is making is that the um the

2:56:33

non-conformity may be height but it renders the building

2:56:39

non-conforming and it will affect the ability to do other things not just

2:56:44

increase the height

2:56:50

correct did you have another comment Adam I would just say yeah could would it be possible if if we're all if you

2:56:57

know when when the city goes back and looks at stuff if we could get some clarification on

2:57:04

19150 Bravo One just to you know maybe I'm reading it wrong um yeah because I'm

2:57:12

I'm not a lawyer okay any other thoughts on Building

2:57:19

height that haven't already been said okay let's move to

2:57:28

12 impervious surface we've had quite a bit of discussion on this already uh Carolyn

2:57:35

sounds like you have something new yeah I I think that the impervious um surface

2:57:43

standard in the development STS as drafted is quite good um it's

2:57:48

exempting uh emergency vehicle Lanes public trails and Synthetic Turf athletic fields but I see that the PRC

2:57:56

is looking for a little more flexibility um but still maintaining a

2:58:01

high bar for increasing total imper surf total impervious surface I can agree

2:58:06

with that I agree with their their initiative there I think the staff has given us a couple of good uh well at

2:58:14

least one good option to add now of those three approaches that are listed

2:58:20

there the first one is just what you already have in the draft and I think that's good I think the second one would

2:58:27

be problematic capping impervious surface as a percent of the total lot size I mean parks are just these

2:58:34

sprawling you know things and I don't think trying to set a level of

2:58:39

impervious surface associated with the size of the park is the way to go and some parks are more recreational and

2:58:45

others are more passive and um you know open space so I would skip the the second um option but the third one I

2:58:53

think is a good thing to add to the draft code it would um allow it would exempt

2:59:02

some very trivial development so that um you wouldn't have to do a park master

2:59:08

plan for some very trivial thing like a shed or a tiny building or something like that so I'm I'm in favor of adding

2:59:16

number three that concept to the draft

2:59:23

standard great um per previous comment I'm really

2:59:30

concerned about storm water control um and I think any statements about impervious are meant to address um

2:59:39

Aesthetics as well as storm water control um and I think folks motivations

2:59:44

for impervious are um highly variable in the community um so I would hope that we'd

2:59:53

figure out a way to um kind of parse that issue a little bit and figure out how to deal with it uh um a little more

3:00:02

accurately based on the the different values that people are coming to this conversation with um from the storm

3:00:09

water point of view um I I think I think we have a a bigger

3:00:15

fish to fry or at least an equally big fish to fry in um in again that that

3:00:22

lack you know the massive amount of lawn we have and and the difference in the

3:00:28

ability of um Forest Lawns and pavement to um prevent uh storm water pollutants

3:00:35

like the 6 PPD quinone which we now know kills salmon um and uh other chemicals

3:00:44

um so for me this is a this is a storm water problem

3:00:49

um and whether it's dealt within this part of the code or a different part of the code I appreciate

3:00:55

uh commissioner bazo's statement that you know this got to go somewhere whether it's here or not you know maybe

3:01:01

staff could offer some options at our next meeting uh about where the topic of impervious surfaces

3:01:10

for storm water control belongs um you know do we nod to it here

3:01:15

or in uh storm water master program or

3:01:20

whatnot is Staff able to um address that and provide options for the next time we

3:01:26

get together yeah I think uh what may be helpful is to point out

3:01:34

where we have existing right because we have a pretty uh robust existing storm water

3:01:42

management program program that's consistent with State and County

3:01:47

regulations so there's there's a lot more to it than just impervious surface for that storm water management piece so

3:01:54

I'll I'll definitely provide some information about where that's located and and what thank you what what it

3:01:59

doesn't address is um I guess I'm saying this doesn't go far enough

3:02:05

um it it doesn't address the our I don't think our storm water code or our Parks

3:02:12

planning process generally um calls for the increase in

3:02:18

um um High infiltration capacity uh landscape types

3:02:24

um ones that offer uh a lot of um evaporation and evapor transpiration and

3:02:31

um better infiltration especially considering the very poor soils and how those impact storm

3:02:38

water um thanks great

3:02:44

yes yeah I'm sort of curious I mean is there some some is there any data that

3:02:52

uh Adam that helps us see where there are storm water problems on the island I guess I'm just trying to figure out I

3:02:57

would have always assumed that the parks were the one place on the island that had the least storm water problem and I

3:03:03

I didn't really appreciate the fields issue um as I've learned a little bit more about it today but I just wondered

3:03:09

if we is there a reason to think that the the parks are sort of at a deficit in terms of their absorption of storm

3:03:16

water compared to other other places on the island I will send out some

3:03:22

resources um it it has to do with infiltration values um and that has to do with how much water um getting from

3:03:30

the streets you know where is it going how is it getting into the the lake um

3:03:35

without being treated properly um and Lawn is um depending on

3:03:43

what table you're looking at there's Manning Z values there's all kinds of different values uh in different hydraulic and or sorry hydrologic models

3:03:51

um but the upshot is that you know lawn is somewhere in between paved surface

3:03:57

and a forest but Al I'll send resources for those so um I got that I just asking

3:04:04

Adam if there was something on the island that you know in their data showed that there was a problem in Parks or Parks were good or is there anything

3:04:11

that indicates where our storm water problems are to the extent we have um I I can take a look before the

3:04:18

February meeting and see what see what we have available

3:04:30

Carolyn oh you're on mute I'm in favor of doing away with

3:04:36

lawn wherever it's not needed for many reasons including surface water runoff

3:04:42

there's a lot of research documenting all of the environmental DET detriment associated with uh coverage of the Earth

3:04:50

with with grass with with Lawns however um I guess what I wanted to ask you know

3:04:57

our mission here is to comment on development regulations for for park

3:05:03

zone and you know what's allowed and what development standards are appropriate I wanted to ask staff do we

3:05:10

have Direction in the pros plan and in fact does the pross plan direct the park

3:05:17

zone the park zone is going to be part of the comprehensive plan and the pros plan is a functional plan which is the

3:05:25

boss and so that's one question which is the boss and the second is is there

3:05:31

already a policy in the pros plan to begin to um reduce the amount of our

3:05:39

Parks land in lawn that is not needed

3:05:44

we we could use to know that the answer to that okay um I will address the

3:05:51

policy question I I don't know the pros plan chapter in verse but sure in terms

3:05:57

of so I can address that in the memo but I think that there's the that question about how this fits within the comp plan

3:06:03

so there's the comprehensive plan is the overarching plan for the city of which the pros plan should be consistent with

3:06:10

and is more specific and then the the policies of both the comp plan and the pros plan should be implemented through

3:06:19

our development regulation so the development regulations implement the comprehensive plan and the other

3:06:24

components of the comprehensive plan um so when we were putting this draft together we were consider we were

3:06:31

referring back to the pros plan to make sure that it was consistent with those policies um and that would be part of

3:06:38

the process uh moving forward

3:06:44

just one followup if I may Mike sure okay so that brings me back to the

3:06:52

realization that we're putting together a park zone

3:06:58

and we're looking at it from the standpoint of regulations right this is not policy is

3:07:05

it right so where would where would we put up if we wanted to take action on

3:07:10

this question of how much lawn we have that's not being used in Parks do we have a policy activity going

3:07:18

on associated with this park zone so if uh if there was a policy if

3:07:26

you want to adopt a policy addressing that that would be appropriate to place

3:07:31

in the land use element um if we're talking about the use of parks land use

3:07:36

um would be a logical place to my knowledge there is not a policy in the

3:07:42

land use element that that addresses the quantity of field in Parks um but we could

3:07:48

um that is that is a policy that could be adopted thanks for food for thought

3:07:54

thank you so I I I have one comment on this

3:08:00

item 12 um that first option uh or possible

3:08:06

approach to incorporate flexibility talks about expanding the list of exempt

3:08:12

use uses uh playgrounds is the example given um

3:08:18

but there's been a lot of discussion tonight about access and need for um

3:08:24

potentially more parking in parks that are used for more active

3:08:32

Recreation um and even some of the ones for Passive Recreation have very limited

3:08:38

parking available to them um you know usually along the street

3:08:44

um I think that that's one of the tradeoffs that we have to be careful of

3:08:50

with um with this issue of no net loss or no more impervious surface because uh

3:08:59

as we as we generate uses in these Parks especially for active Recreation the

3:09:05

people need to park somewhere um and uh so we need to be mindful of that in in

3:09:12

this list of exemp uses or developments going forward

3:09:20

Adam um yeah on the on the growing the parking topic I mean I I I like the

3:09:27

point that uh commissioner Q's brought up about six Papa Delta papa papa Delta

3:09:32

quino that's a compound in that stabilizes rubber uh which is used in car tires and bus tires so if we if we

3:09:40

try to expand the parking in the Parks we're we're bringing more of that to the island presumably because our parks are

3:09:46

amazing right people are going to come from the from perhaps further from Lake Washington uh to come you know to our

3:09:53

Parks bringing it into what we'll eventually drain into there so I think yeah let's you know there's the uses but

3:10:01

I appreciate commissioner iugh bringing the science into this too and if we grow those parking lots um I'm

3:10:07

also hearing that parking lots are less are are

3:10:13

have you know they they absorb less than open grass which of course absorbs less than tree canopy um is is growing our

3:10:22

parking beyond the Beyond this this the residents desires and the the look of

3:10:27

those is it is a good science to encourage more cars to come to the island and bring their pollutants into

3:10:35

our

3:10:40

Parks any further thoughts on number

3:10:50

12 okay on to 13

3:10:57

lighting we talked about this a little bit already um any further thoughts on

3:11:09

that Carolyn

3:11:15

I was just finding it in my documents here just just just one second maybe somebody else wants to go first no okay

3:11:22

just a

3:11:30

second uh Adam Zach um do you you know I know I know we have pretty sense of

3:11:38

lighting um on island CR on the island crest Way park with the ball fields

3:11:44

there and that gets a lot of use at night and then the same at the middle

3:11:50

school um do we have any any

3:11:55

other parks that have extensive lighting like that to permit

3:12:02

outdoor activities the high school yeah oh the

3:12:07

high school of course yeah

3:12:13

yeah I think that's the only example the only other place with the that kind of

3:12:20

lighting does the park commission or you

3:12:26

know does the city overall Envision developing more active

3:12:32

Recreation facilities that allow for night activities in the future that we

3:12:39

have to be cognizant of I mean you know it's been uh 20 years or uh

3:12:46

yeah 20 years since I coached my daughter's soccer team but even at that

3:12:51

point there was a dir of adequate spaces and you know

3:12:59

uh and you know to to have practices or have games and at at night so you know

3:13:07

I'm curious as to whether there's any appetite in the city to expand

3:13:12

facilities that would be well lit like those three

3:13:19

are I I think that would be a good question for Park staff at the PRC

3:13:25

meeting on February 8th GN I tend to agree with what the

3:13:33

prc's input is here um I have not noticed the

3:13:39

city I I'm thinking there might need to be a a standard additional standard well let me think we already have the

3:13:46

one lighting standard that's that's proposed now is it sufficient or not I'm

3:13:51

thinking that it might not be sufficient and might need Improvement for example um I haven't noticed that the

3:13:59

city is installing lighting fixtures at athletic fields that again direct the

3:14:05

light down rather than into the eyes of passing motorists or P pedestrians

3:14:12

walking by I also don't um I'm not sure now getting Beyond athletic fields which

3:14:18

need very bright lights I'm also not seeing that the city is seeking the

3:14:24

right lumens for the job I'm seeing exceedingly white bright light now which

3:14:29

is sort of all the rage um being installed and not directed so um anyway

3:14:35

we we might need I think there might be some case for some improvement on

3:14:41

that

3:14:52

okay on 14 any thoughts on

3:15:01

14 Victor uh just a question is this uh covered by the design commission would

3:15:08

this would would this be something the design commission works on

3:15:14

um it would depend on the design standards that were established um so if

3:15:19

we were to create a process where the design commission needed to review those

3:15:24

design St um res a review a proposal for consistency with um but that would it

3:15:32

would depend on how we structured those design standards how was it done for the Town Center was it the design commission

3:15:39

yes yeah in general the Town Center development in the Town Center um that meets the thresholds in the code would

3:15:46

have to be reviewed by the design commission um

3:15:52

yeah Carn well I I was going to say that I

3:15:57

didn't think that design standards would be needed for the park zone um given the city's review prog Pro

3:16:07

process already so I guess I'm not I'm not so sure I agree with the p C on on

3:16:13

that particular uh Point

3:16:18

okay any further thoughts on 14 one question for uh Adam Zach um it

3:16:26

says in your explanation regarding number 14 that the city already undertakes public review of design for

3:16:33

many capital Improvement projects could you just clarify what that means by many um you know which ones would and which

3:16:40

ones wouldn't yeah yeah there's a I don't know the exact threshold but um a

3:16:46

lot of Capital Improvements go through a process where their design is reviewed

3:16:54

um publicly with the city council in advance of uh moving forward on that

3:17:00

project a good example would be the recent um bike skills area that was

3:17:06

reviewed um by the city council um in the last year um so there were several

3:17:13

iterations of the design of that um facility before it was eventually uh

3:17:19

moved through the process so we many Capital Improvements go through that

3:17:24

okay thank you I think that's probably

3:17:31

sufficient uh 15 any

3:17:37

comments Victor do we have a definition of what

3:17:43

development is because I think earlier in our

3:17:48

conversation in fact at the beginning of our conversation when I asked about it it was it could have been building a

3:17:56

playground or something like that I think I think it would be useful here to get very very specific on what we mean

3:18:02

about development when we say development um development is defined in

3:18:09

the code in chapter 19161 Z in the D definitions um it is a piece of land

3:18:16

that contains building structures and other modifications to the natural environment or the alteration of the

3:18:23

natural environment through the construction or exterior alteration of any building or structure whether above

3:18:30

or below ground or water and any grading filling dredging draining channelizing

3:18:35

cutting topping or excavation associated with such construction or modification

3:18:40

the placing of permanent or temporary obstructions that interfere with the Normal public use of the waters and land

3:18:46

subject to this code and and the division of land into two or more parcels and the adjustment of property

3:18:53

lines between

3:18:59

Parcels that's crazy broad I mean

3:19:06

yeah uh Carolyn I don't think I agree with PRC on this one uh given there's so

3:19:12

many restrictions already that are Incorporated in this package to on development and the limitations based on

3:19:19

impervious surface I don't think going the other way and saying well here's the maximum you can do is really a

3:19:25

worthwhile exercise

3:19:30

okay uh seeing no further hands uh we're on to the last

3:19:36

one number 16 we've touched on this already are

3:19:42

there any further comments about this Carolyn um I don't understand again

3:19:49

um are these areas in the new Zone I mean maybe I look at the map but I

3:19:56

didn't have one printed but um are they in the new Zone and subject to the same

3:20:03

regulations say like Pioneer

3:20:08

Park these are proposed to be zoned uh Parks under the proposal the these two

3:20:15

Open Spaces do the existing limitations in

3:20:21

the open space Conservancy I presume there's an ordinance or section of code

3:20:26

governing that does that section supersede anything that's going to be in the park

3:20:33

zone um so the management of those Pro properties um is the open space

3:20:41

conservant trust oversees those um properties and the management of those

3:20:46

properties um I think that the new development regulations

3:20:52

would um they would they would apply there and so anything any of the management would be subject to those

3:20:59

development standards sorry that's a really a general answer but that's all the wor that's good thank you I I think

3:21:06

I understand I mean I understand the impact there Andie

3:21:12

um I think this is one you know when they say consider how this Zone relates

3:21:18

to the open space Conservancy trust that's such a

3:21:24

nonspecific uh very difficult like if I received that comment I'm just not sure

3:21:29

how I would like it needs more specificity on what they mean by consider how it relates like is that

3:21:35

just answering an informational question or are we trying to make these are we trying to relate these spaces um so I'd

3:21:43

be curious to dig in further on that to see what they actually mean like what are we really trying to get at um I

3:21:49

think I do just want a point of clarification from Adam if I'm looking at the land

3:21:56

use map um the only is the only open space

3:22:03

not included in the Parks the

3:22:10

I90 um on the land use map

3:22:15

yes so I the I90 strip is the only strip not included in the Parks

3:22:23

Zone to my knowledge yes okay I think that's actually an important distinction

3:22:29

that then again lends to some of the things I was pointing to about what we're actually able to Zone and make

3:22:37

rules on and what we're not and why

3:22:44

Barn is that a new hand yes you know I just noticed something on this um land

3:22:50

use map it's again it's a little bit of a problem with the colors but there is a item in the key

3:22:57

called open space and if you look at Pioneer Park the angstrom property on

3:23:03

the far East Side that Jets out that's a different color from the park but it's still

3:23:13

okay so oh well maybe it doesn't make any difference it looks like you're including something called open space in

3:23:20

the park zone as well and then there's that other looks like another open space

3:23:26

parcel of you know quarter of a mile to the north of Pioneer Park I don't know what that is but I think I think would

3:23:33

really help to get some colors corrected on this map because I don't know what's going where here um but I guess doesn't really

3:23:40

matter they're open space and they're still going into the park zone okay thanks answered my own

3:23:47

question Adam yeah I'll I'll I think I said at the beginning but yeah I I have

3:23:52

some difficulties with the colors on that uh land use map so if there's any

3:23:59

way that could be clarified or patterned um that would be

3:24:05

appreciated um and I've got two other questions but would be after

3:24:12

discussion of number 16 if allowed uh I think we're done with 16 so

3:24:20

if you have another question or comment sure um yeah one one thing I'd like to

3:24:25

at least bring up to the commission um it's a real the first one's tiny and the

3:24:31

other one's really big so I'll start with the small one um the definition of agricultural activities um I I love

3:24:38

walking through the P patches up by Luther Burbank um little concerned to

3:24:43

see the production of animals included in there um smell noise

3:24:50

concerns um you know larger animals need structures um so would just like to

3:24:57

throw that out there for other Commissioners to think about you know what what do they think about it in their comments I would I would Advocate

3:25:03

that we uh scrap animals from the definition of agricultural activities um and then the other big one

3:25:10

there was some public comment about you know you we're talking about what to include into the park zone um I thought

3:25:18

I think there's a pretty good public comment about what it would take to get something out of the park zone and

3:25:24

heightening the standard for that um would like to hear some some thoughts from other Commissioners uh because you

3:25:31

know once we call something a park there's it seems like there

3:25:36

is you know there there will always be pressure to you know you know turn it into

3:25:42

something else um so how can we yeah I'd like to hear what other Commissioners think about once we've said some's a

3:25:49

park how do we keep it a

3:25:55

park Adam I I'm not sure if I understand that are you saying how do we keep it a park or how

3:26:02

do we keep it undeveloped into say active Recreation from passive

3:26:08

Recreation uh different very important things uh may I clad yeah yeah I would

3:26:16

say how do we let once some to clarify once something is zoned Park how do we ensure that it remains zoned Park um I

3:26:24

don't see here any height you know high standard to prevent rezoning and I

3:26:31

thought that was a I thought that was an interesting point raised in the public comments
okay so your your concern is

3:26:37

with potential rezones yeah I would I I I like liked the idea of trying to define a

3:26:44

heightened standard for unparking a park from a zoning perspective

3:26:50

okay Kate um I I think the city is always

3:26:57

going to retain its right to uh it's one of its inherent rights to determine

3:27:04

zoning and uh modify zoning it's why we have these comp plan processes but I I

3:27:10

think in the spirit of the comment like um I think a tiered system like I think

3:27:17

advocating for a tiered system um and I think we're all going to have to be flexible in that in
that um you know if

3:27:26

you if you have a tiered system whereby you say this is meant for forested Natural Area um
and and offer some

3:27:34

pretty strict um guidance on that and possibly some aspirational goals on that

3:27:40

um you know I think I think it's less likely that it's going to be turned into

3:27:46

something completely random whereas if you say this is something that has active use or this is something where

3:27:51

there are already some City active City buildings and functions you know really just defining those tiers and being

3:27:58

really explicit uh about what the purpose of each tier is and having some

3:28:04

um you know not excessive but a few sideboards on what would be considered in and out of that um

3:28:12

you know it gives the city uh and the Commissioners the Parks Commission it gives everyone the flexibility to

3:28:19

consider trade-offs and um and to negotiate what what we think is desired

3:28:25

now and in the in the future um not everyone's going to get everything they want if they do that it is a more

3:28:31

complicated process um but I I think it gives us a venue by which we can

3:28:37

consider tradeoffs and possibly build some of that trust that's um but but

3:28:44

that doesn't mean that everyone gets everything they want there's some pretty um Hardline statements being made about

3:28:52

um you know everything has to be this or that or the other you know um everything

3:28:57

can't be everything to everyone all the time and everyone's happy you know we we do have to have some trade-offs and I

3:29:04

think the tiered system does give us that flexibility um and I think it also would make it a little more durable

3:29:10

which I think was um commissioner Rick's you know question

3:29:16

is how do we make this durable and I think we make it durable by by having discreet

3:29:24

tear Carolyn you have another comment yeah um Adam why does the definition of

3:29:33

agricultural activities I presume you're trying to get at pea patches is that what this is about do we need a

3:29:39

definition for agriculture cultural activities one and if we do need a definition for agricultural activities

3:29:46

in order to allow a Pea Patch or for the city to for example um do their stewardship work and

3:29:53

and some of their propagation their plant propagation or something why why would animals be added there are you

3:30:01

just trying to be consistent with some other definition some other place sure um so the first part of your question is

3:30:10

we would need to if we're going to allow agricultural uses in our Parks it's

3:30:16

helpful to have a definition of that use um EST the code okay um for the proposed

3:30:23

definitions I used the APA the American Planning Association uh planner's dictionary as a

3:30:29

reference and mostly Drew from that um rather than reinvent the wheel and

3:30:35

create uh from Whole cloth if if I I wasn't I it didn't occur to me

3:30:43

that uh that raising livestock would be thought of as a potential thing that happened in

3:30:50

city park so bun could take out taking out animals from the definition probably

3:30:55

doesn't really affect things to okay I mean there is when we're establishing these definitions and it it came up in

3:31:02

The Matrix too I think it's important to remember that um if if we name a use and

3:31:09

establish a definition for it and then we say agricultural uses in another Zone

3:31:14

just to use that as an example then that that other Zone would also be subject to

3:31:20

these definitions so in general that's why the proposed definitions are fairly broad because thinking about this as

3:31:28

things that may apply in other zones in the future at some point but we can narrow them down that's part of what the

3:31:34

Planning Commission is is here to do right is to refine The Proposal okay

3:31:41

could see the usefulness of having it be um applicable to other zones but okay thank

3:31:47

you okay I think we've gotten through it Adam thank you very much for your

3:31:52

presentation and for fielding a lot of difficult questions um it's we've got a lot of

3:31:59

things to cover in our PRC meeting on the 8th hopefully uh you've kept track

3:32:08

of that as as well as you could um so but thank you very much that was

3:32:14

um Illuminating uh and uh I think we had a

3:32:19

good discussion uh there are clearly differences of opinion and there as

3:32:25

cases pointed out not everyone's going to get their own way um and we're going

3:32:30

to have to strike some reasonable compromises and uh we may have to go

3:32:36

down a different path with a tiered approach U or some very iation on that

3:32:41

but uh but let's get to it and uh again thank you for that so uh move on to

3:32:48

other business uh Alison is there a deputy director report just very briefly I know we're

3:32:56

all getting tired um we are working on a

3:33:01

schedule for say the next six months or so of work for the commission um we

3:33:07

talked a little bit earlier in the meeting about you know what's coming up in the next couple months for this park

3:33:13

zone um kind of simultaneous to that work um the housing work group is going

3:33:18

to be reconvening and meeting several times and then the culmination of that

3:33:24

will be their recommendation of a draft housing element will come back to the commission sometime around March um and

3:33:33

then we're going to be working out kind of the details of what happens from there it's very likely that we're going

3:33:38

to need to add some special meetings in March and April and perhaps beyond that

3:33:44

um and so we'll need to have some talks about how to schedule those and the preferred dates and that sort of thing I

3:33:50

think our plan is to work with the chair and vice chair to get um some initial

3:33:56

thoughts together on that in terms of a proposal and then check in with the rest of you about availability um prior to

3:34:03

finalizing the schedule so you'll be hearing more about that here soon I just wanted to I think I talked with most of

3:34:09

you about this on our one ones but um you know there are there is going to be a need for extra meetings coming up here

3:34:16

later this year and and we'll we'll continue that conversation

3:34:22

okay anything else that's it thank you thank you uh any planned absences for

3:34:29

future meetings no okay that's good okay the next

3:34:38

regular meeting is scheduled for um Wednesday February 28th at 6: p.m. we

3:34:44

have our special meeting with the uh PRC on the 8th um and so there being no

3:34:51

other business to come before the Planning Commission time is now 9:39

3:34:56

p.m. and the meeting is adjourned as a reminder please stay seated until the

3:35:02

and on screen until the city staff has terminated the broadcast good evening and thank you for

3:35:09

joining us and uh call at

3:35:15

night