

GMHB EXHIBIT 225

2024-04-17 Planning Commission Transcript

0:03

okay we're live okay good evening and welcome to the April 17 2024 special

0:10

hybrid Planning Commission meeting I'm Mike Murphy chair tonight's hybrid

0:15

Planning Commission meeting is being brought to you courtesy of Zoom welcome to all and thank you for joining us

0:22

tonight Commissioners please have your mics turned on for the roll

0:28

call and I don't know if Alison or Zach someone's going to do the role I guess

0:34

yeah I'll call the role uh commissioner acuse present uh commissioner bazo

0:43

here uh commissioner Bozman president commissioner gals

0:49

here commissioner RIS here uh Vice chair

0:55

ragab not here and chair Murphy here

1:02

okay the Quorum is present uh for this meeting we will continue to use the zoom platform I'll

1:09

do my best to recognize you in the order in which hands are raised after being

1:14

recognized you may then ask your question make your comments or what have you uh the first item of business is

1:21

public appearances this is the opportunity for anyone to speak to the commission about issues of

1:28

concern uh Ellison is there anyone who has signed up for appearances that wish to address the commission no no one

1:35

signed up this evening okay the first item of regular business

1:41

is to review and consider approving the minutes of the March 27 regular meeting

1:47

Commissioners may I have a motion to approve the minutes so moved second it's been moved and

1:55

seconded um does anyone have any comments or corrections to

2:02

minutes seeing No Hands uh Zach can you please conduct a roll call

2:09

vote uh commissioner accuse hi uh commissioner bazu hi commissioner

2:17

Bozman hi commissioner GS hi uh

2:23

commissioner raes I and chair Murphy I okay the minutes are approved

2:31

unanimously now the second item of um of special business is the Planning

2:37

Commission Bill PCB agenda I'm sorry agenda Bill PCB

2:44

2407 comprehensive Plan update parks and climate amendments and welcome Alison

2:51

van gorp deputy director to present uh this item to us thank you chair I'm just

2:59

gonna share my screen here all

3:05

right start this off okay this is a pretty short

3:12

presentation I want to go through and then I can kind of switch back and forth with

3:18

the tables that are in the agenda bill that show the major and minor amendments

3:24

as well as the actual drafts um as we talk about those so

3:29

we've got kind of three pieces to go through tonight the climate goals and policies the parks and open space

3:34

element and then some other changes to the land use element um to reflect those two other

3:40

pieces um the climate piece is we're taking a direction of doing minimal

3:46

amendments at this time I know we talked about this uh month or so back um there

3:54

is new state legislation that requires us to update the or create a climate

3:59

element um by 2029 we talked about whether to you know

4:04

pull some of these policies into a separate element now or keep them kind of distributed how they are I think for

4:12

now the staff would like to just take a light touch leave things how they are

4:17

and we can come back in a couple years and do the updates that are required by the new legislation at that time um for

4:25

now we need to adopt the climate action plan by reference and and then provide

4:30

policy direction that we're intending to make those further amendments to comply

4:36

with the state legislation so those changes are in the draft and then a couple of

4:42

small amendments to policies 21.3 and 28.1 these were just intended to update

4:50

them um kind of to the current situation 21.3 has to do with green

4:56

building and I just wanted to reflect that um we do have a current Green Building requirement in the town center

5:03

and you know that could be expanded in the future um and that's something we can look at through this policy and then

5:12

28.1 um it said that we should prioritize preventing climate change and

5:19

wanted to acknowledge that you know the science is telling us it's not really possible to fully prevent climate change

5:24

at this point and so instead we should talk about prioritizing um reduction of

5:29

further climate emissions so that's that for climate um

5:37

the parks and open space element oh I see a hand up sorry yeah I had just a

5:42

quick question when I was reviewing everything there was a note that says you added something to

5:49

acknowledge that climate change was going to be difficult to directly

5:54

address or stop and when I read through all the materials that were provided to

5:59

us I didn't actually see that reference so I was just wondering if you could either now or later just point me to

6:05

where I should be looking for that particular it's that one in 28.1 um do you know what exhibit that is

6:13

it's in exhibit one the land use element okay and it's the end it's like the

6:22

third to last thing in that exhibit okay thanks

6:30

Carolyn yes I I have a question about the policy 21.3 where you mentioned that

6:39

the Green Building requirements are adopted for the town center and are reflected in policy 21.3 but I don't

6:47

really see them actually being reflected let's see here 21 it so so they they are

6:56

mentioned in 21.3 but that doesn't appear to me to be only for

7:02

the town center or is that only for the Town Center uh well we already have a Green Building certification requirement

7:08

in the Town Center so I wanted to edit this to say consider expanding those requirements to all zones okay it doesn't

7:17

specifically say Town Center but I think that's okay implied I guess so so this is to to add that um

7:25

to to residential areas as well right outside the Town Center basically yeah I

7:31

mean it's not specific which other zones but it's just saying consider expanding it to other zones okay okay thanks very

7:44

much okay moving on to the parks and open

7:49

space element um this one similarly we took a really

7:54

high level approach oh this is a I should say we're

8:01

just going to change it Rose

8:09

plan that's what I get for copying and pasting I guess um all right so the pro parks and

8:17

open space element is taking this really high level approach because the pros plan already has very extensive array of

8:26

goals and objectives um you might be aware that was a pretty long public process to develop the pros plan A

8:32

couple of years ago and when we were looking at that and trying to figure out how to reference it and align it with

8:39

this new element it pretty quickly became evident that we would be either kind of like

8:45

copying existing material from the pros plan or duplicating it in some other way and it just didn't make sense um there's

8:52

already eight goals and 80 objectives there we don't need to duplicate or

8:58

recreate the wheel on those we can just have some simple references to the plan um and then also

9:05

provide the policy Direction related to adopting the open space Zone and the park zone um since those are coming up

9:13

the open space Zone will be part of this comp plan work and then the park zone will be following shortly

9:22

thereafter um is that a new hand Caroline or yeah sorry I kind of like

9:28

back and forth there trying to get attention um looking at this uh

9:35

comparison of land use element in the Parks and open space with the prods

9:41

everything seemed to match except for there was this one policy number

9:46

20.11 which didn't seem to match very closely the objective 3.8 from pross so

9:53

is this a good time in the discussion to mention that or would we want to get in that kind of detail later Mike

10:02

uh Allison as far as your presentation is this a good time or do you want to

10:07

defer this until later um I think it's fine to talk about it now I think if we're talking about

10:13

specific amendments we can get to those later but just kind of clarifying what's what is fine to do

10:21

now okay so 20.1 um is in regards to considering the purchase of land to add

10:29

to community open space to prioritize the purchase and preservation of

10:34

wetlands and stream Headwaters but the objective 3.8 in the

10:40

pr doesn't mention wetlands and stream headquarter

10:46

headquarters or or or anything like that in particular is there a way to preserve

10:54

that policy intention from the draft the current plan somehow in the policies for

11:02

parks and open space I think actually let me double check I think we ended up

11:08

moving or this policy it's shown in this list which

11:14

is kind of odd because I think it's actually a policy from 19 that we had

11:20

considered like there was a few iterations of how we went about this and at first we were thinking about keeping

11:28

some of these policy from the land use element and bringing them over into the parks element and we had moved one from

11:34

goal 19 I let me confirm let me find it I think that this policy remains under

11:40

our goal 19 in the land use element uhuh let me find it and then I can put it on

11:46

the screen yeah

11:51

okay if I can remember which number it is

12:06

Alison it's 19 yeah it's 1912 um on page five of exhibit

12:15

one I think that one's slightly

12:22

different oh wait that yeah that's the shoreline sorry yeah so the one I was

12:27

thinking of is 19 11 MH which has to do with private

12:35

property yeah this this one seems to have been under parks and open space because of

12:42

the idea that that's where the pures would occur you know yeah I think you're right and so this objective that's

12:49

listed 3.8 is more General

12:54

um it just says like consider oppos opportunities to buffer and enhance the built

13:02

environment so I guess in the situation where the pr doesn't really contain a

13:09

policy or goal or policy that pertains to a policy that's in the comp plan if

13:15

if it is thought to be a good policy could we keep it um Parks an open space

13:21

element I know it would look a little bit like an orphan but yeah it would um

13:27

yeah I guess potentially we could I think the city manager Jesse Bond

13:32

actually helped prepare this chart and I know that she felt that all of these

13:38

existing land use policies were the subject matter was well covered

13:44

by Pros um I know I agree that this language doesn't spell out um wetlands

13:51

and stream Headwaters in the same way but I think the feeling from the city

13:56

manager and the park staff is that the int was covered by this

14:02

uhuh okay so I wonder if there's a policy in Pros that directs the purchase

14:08

of say like critical areas for example you know areas that are particularly valuable for wildlife because that would

14:15

tend to get at the intent of this but I I wouldn't know if they have a policy

14:20

like that but um I guess I would recommend keeping it unless we can find

14:28

that it's sufficiently addressed uh in the pros

14:34

someplace um is that possible at this point

14:41

um like in terms of keeping it or in terms of checking to see if it's represented

14:49

somewhere keeping it yeah can can we keep it um we we will have another pass

14:56

at the com the draft comprehensive plan after the open house and if at that

15:02

point we have further information we could um delet it at that

15:09

point I see a couple other hands popping up so let's hear what everyone has to say and sure

15:18

C uh Victor I think you next so when you read 1911 out

15:27

loud um it struck me a little bit funny um I don't think you're supporting

15:34

the conf conservation of private property I think you're actually supporting the conservation of something

15:41

on private property um I second that so

15:49

conservation of what do you mean by something on private property like uh well the entire the entire island is

15:56

almost private property so I don't think that's the intent here uh and I don't and I don't I don't

16:03

kind of looking at the section that it's in um and I don't I don't know what was

16:08

originally here but it's it's it sounds like the intent was you're trying to conser conserve something whether it's

16:15

it's Wetlands or tree canopy or or something on private property yeah I

16:20

mean I think the word conservation here is used generally to refer

16:26

to tools that could either protect protect a specific resource like you just mentioned or prevent development of

16:32

that property like transfer of development rights would be used to remove the development Potential from

16:38

the property I guess my point is this is worded in a very awkward way and it

16:44

sounds like you're trying to conserve private property that is the intent of this

16:50

wording um with conserve kind of construed a bit broadly and that it

16:56

could mean either prevent development or protecting a specific resource like

17:04

trees or Wetlands yeah I think we're conserving I I think Victor you're right

17:12

uh a very simple word word change there could be support con conservation on

17:18

private property yep that would work

17:34

I think if Mercer Island is intending to conserve private property in a

17:40

particular manner other than what we are trying to address here we might want to

17:46

think of other wording but I agree with Mike's

17:51

adjustment if that makes sense are you okay with that Alison I'm

17:58

okay with that I don't think that has a big impact on how this works

18:06

yeah Chris did you have another comment actually I had the same exact

18:11

comment and it would also take theeth out support conservation on private property

18:18

okay but that was exactly what I was going to say okay Andie do you have

18:23

another thing Dan well I want to go back to I think what Carolyn was pointing to

18:28

and what Allison was trying to address so um if we are talking about con

18:37

conservation of water courses and wetlands I do see under natural

18:44

environment policies goal 18 addresses sensitive lands like water

18:50

courses under several goals underneath goal 18 that I feel like are similar to

18:57

or address the purp of what Carolyn is pointing to um and so I'm wondering if folks

19:04

could just take a look at that and then gold 196 talks about protecting wildlife

19:10

habitats Forest water courses wetlands and shorelines which I felt like was part of

19:17

what Carolyn was also pointing to so I think I'm just drawing attention as Commissioners to that to see if that

19:23

addresses the request because I feel like it's kind of laced in several places in goals in exhibit one of what

19:31

we were looking

19:43

at yeah I think what's maybe not as clear is that the King County public

19:48

benefit rating system and transfer of development rights programs those inherently give you more points if you

19:56

have streams and wetlands so um perhaps as staff and the city manager were

20:02

considering this they were aware of that that that would be um stream

20:09

conservation of streams and wetlands was sort of inherently in those programs you're going to get more points it's already encouraged but you know I agree

20:17

with Carolyn that it's a little problematic that it's not explicit um but I'm comfortable with it just because

20:24

I know it's implicit uh in those programs

20:34

uh Carolyn yeah um this part of our comprehensive plan has always been

20:40

rather a little bit confusing and hard to follow but the natural environment policies in goal

20:46

18 and um the policies in goal 19 so

20:51

both 18 and 19 come under the topic of natural environment policies they just

20:56

apply everywhere you know they're they're kind of not specific to parks

21:02

for example whereas this policy that is in was in the under parks

21:08

and recre parks and Open Space is really directing the parks department to

21:16

emphasize purchasing the places that are incredibly more valuable for wildlife

21:22

when they have opportunities to spend money um to purchase likewise the King

21:29

County public benefit rating system and the transfer of development rights those

21:34

are things that that help people reduce their taxes for example you know private

21:40

property owners so that does pertain to private property and the other policy we

21:46

were talking of that um Victor requested a change in so I would would say that

21:55

this 2011 is is really it's a parks it's a Parks

22:03

policy even though it was in the wrong place I think I just discovered where it

22:11

is actually living under go 19 it's 1910 I don't know why I didn't see this

22:16

a few minutes ago but if you look at 1910 yeah is this exact policy so did

22:22

this get moved from somewhere else it it

22:27

was always at 1910 but we had considered moving it somewhere else and then decided not to and so it got included in

22:34

this chart when it really shouldn't have it really didn't need to be okay

22:39

so I guess I would suggest that it should be moved to the parks the parks

22:46

um policy because it it has to do with purchase of open space and expanding

22:54

Open Spaces

23:03

these policies in 18 and 19 and Parks you know have for many years been rather

23:09

tangled up and I'm really glad to see them being separated out now um this one

23:15

should be with Parks though I think um that is not entirely clear you could

23:23

have city-owned property that is purchased to protect

23:29

some Headwaters or Wetlands for other purposes relating to storm water control

23:35

Etc and they would not be part of parks so I don't think that should be moved I

23:41

think Allison uh has it in the right place it and I think it should remain there if

23:48

the city decides to put property it acquires into the park system than

23:54

Soviet but I think this is more uh appr appropriate in a more generic or general

24:02

category such as

24:26

this uh Carolyn um May I add that the policy the very

24:32

first phrase in the policy is when considering the purchase of land to add

24:37

to community open space so um my interpretation of community open space

24:43

and we're currently developing an open space Zone and we have many Open Spaces

24:49

that are part of the park system that that would be what we're talking about

24:56

here that was what we meant when we drafted the policy six years ago that's

25:02

what we were talking about and that we we meant the open space properties um owned by the

25:10

city available for trails and wildlife and nature and so on and so forth we

25:15

were trying to um encourage these incredibly valuable

25:22

places stream Headwaters Wetlands that um are associated with

25:29

uh tremendous improved wildlife

25:35

habitat uh

25:42

Kate yeah I I think I hear what Carolyn is saying um what I'm concerned about is

25:50

that we don't actually have that open space policy yet and

25:58

concerned that changes word smithing of that policy or whatnot um you know could make could

26:06

make things inconsistent and then I also agree with the chair that um we do want this to apply to any type

26:15

of open space regardless of how Parks you know what parks calls the open space

26:22

Zone um yeah so I agree that we we do need to

26:27

maintain I'm glad to see the Alis you found it in the in the in 1910 um but I'm a little bit concerned

26:35

about tying it to parks with an open space keeping it tied to that open space

26:41

when that definition of open space is going to change and we don't know what it's going to change to I want it to apply

26:54

broadly so are you suggesting that it should be

26:59

um some of the reference uh when considering the purchase of land to add

27:08

to public space or something like that just to be safe for now or is that what

27:15

you're getting at I guess I'm I'm guess I'm suggesting maybe it's a it's it's a discussion

27:22

because I I think chair Murphy if it if it is going to apply broadly and not

27:27

just two parks then it should not say then it then it belongs in the land

27:33

use element and it should not say open space because open space has a specific definition and that definition isn't

27:40

flux right well and it's as well we all recall from recent

27:47

discussions that not all um Road end parks are parks uh that's because there

27:55

are essential public facilities in some of those and so they don't characterize them as or list them as

28:02

parks and so I think we need to leave that open I think the open question is

28:10

uh Kate you're correct is what language do we use here or do we just bookmark it

28:16

to um reflect that it may need to be changed in the future once the parks and

28:22

open space gets better defined

28:31

yeah I think flagging it for the future uh is that okay for the staff to flag it

28:38

that the word open space there yeah I mean I think since we will

28:43

be adopting the open space Zone as part of the comp plan we can look at that

28:52

term for consistency with that code Amendment once we get it once we get the

28:57

draft from the parks and Ro commission and I'm happy just to make a

29:04

note to remind us of that okay do we have consensus on that

29:11

approach Carol you have one final comment I yeah have a question so um I

29:17

want to make sure I understand what the the approach is but first I wanted to ask

29:22

Allison with this policy located where it is right now who or what does it

29:28

apply to you know I think it applies broadly I

29:37

think you know we like we will be adding a definition to the city code for open

29:44

space lands as a part of that zoning effort um

29:51

but prior to that happening this is an undefined term and okay I think especially with the word Community there

29:58

yeah it can mean things that aren't necessarily city property um to me that

30:04

could mean other privately owned spaces or spaces owned by other public agencies

30:12

that are also available or habitat or for Passive

30:17

Recreation so in in regards to considering updating the

30:22

term um you're thinking of changing it to

30:30

so that it doesn't apply to the I'm sorry I maybe I should just ask you um

30:36

to explain again what updating the term is meant to accomplish I'm not quite

30:42

sure need is that question for me Caroline or

30:47

for Alis for Alis please I was the one that raised it yeah well for my perspective and then
Kate feel free to

30:54

chime in after um we would need to clar ify whether we mean open space lands in

31:02

quotes which are going to be these specifically designated City properties um or do we
mean something

31:11

broader than that that could include other types of city property or potentially property
that's owned by

31:17

someone besides the city okay yeah I I just hope that the upshot of it is that

31:25

since it was attended to apply apply to purchases for open space in the parks

31:32

department that this policy be included

31:38

in in parks in some way in open space in the new zone for example when you have

31:44

policies for that zone identified um is it possible that

31:50

this policy could be moved I guess in in addition to maybe exploring redefining

31:55

the term could the policy be moved later in the process yes we can still make changes

32:02

like that later in the process okay so I would recommend you know flagging it for consideration to be moved as

32:09

well okay okay thanks uh Chris yeah I

32:15

guess given your point before uh Mike that it might be good to Polly outside parks too it could be moved or

32:21

uplicated right it could be also here and there um to some extent and I guess

32:26

the other thing I was just going to I mean I'm fine with what what's there and what we have I guess the other option I

32:31

haven't quite figured out why we haven't talked about is just to take out the restraining phrase to add to community

32:36

open space when you know when considering purchase of land prioritize the purchase of preservation of wetlands

32:42

and stream Headwaters and maybe that's too broad but you know just wanted to

32:47

raise it as a

32:52

possibility okay uh anything else

32:58

bar is that an old hand old hand old hand sorry there okay okay thank you

33:03

okay so it seems like we have consensus to keep this here to flag it to change

33:11

possibly change the terminology there based on how the community open space

33:17

and Parks RS come together uh and thirdly to consider either moving or

33:24

duplicating this in the parks in open space um policies is that a fair summary

33:31

sounds good okay any to me any

33:36

objections okay hearing none I've got that noted down and we can include that with our consistency analysis and bring

33:43

that back for further consideration down the road great thank you um next Allison

33:50

you got a little derailed there yeah all right I lost my place in this PowerPoint

33:55

but I think yeah I was about to move on to talk about the

34:01

other changes in the land use element so these are just related

34:07

to kind of aligning with the parks and open space element being created

34:13

um so it's relocating and removing some of

34:19

the existing policies in the land use element gold 20 is moved over to the parks and open space element as goal one

34:26

there slightly revised but it provides the highle piece there and then there's

34:33

three policies that one of which we just talked about that aren't actually

34:40

they're separate from the one we just talked about but right next to it so 1911

34:48

197 and 15

34:55

something or moved 15 .4 because they don't really have to do

35:02

with park or open space land specifically one had to do with private

35:08

Recreation facilities and clubs one had to do with private

35:15

property um and you know these didn't make sense

35:20

to be in the Parks and open space element they made sense to stay somewhere in the land use element so

35:26

that's why we've relocated them um and then those 10 policies that are

35:31

in the chart are proposed to be emitted because we felt that they

35:37

were covered that subject matter was covered

35:43

um I think if there's other specific questions about those we can after I get

35:49

through this PowerPoint I'll pull up the draft and we can look at them in context again yeah I do I do have a question on

35:56

19.7 but I'll hold that till later okay

36:02

thank you um all right so then over the last

36:08

few days a couple of proposed amendments have come in from Commissioners I wanted

36:13

to just kind of fly over those and then again we can look at them in the draft so commissioner gells had proposed

36:20

adding a policy um to 27.6.2009

36:29

encouraging reduction of greenhouse gas emissions um through encouraging smaller

36:36

housing units moderate density housing including D duplexes and triplexes and the use of Green Building Materials and

36:43

techniques um we were going back and forth on email today this afternoon on the wording of that Chris I pulled here

36:50

the latest version if you want to make additional changes to that when we talk about it that's fine but I thought this

36:55

would be a good place to start um and then I also heard from chair

37:01

Murphy about policy 17.3 this one is not related to Parks or

37:08

climate but I think he just noticed something while looking at the land use element um oops

37:14

keep um and he wanted to suggest changing the word minimize to mitigate

37:32

so in terms of how to go through all of these

37:37

proposals with had a chart in the um agenda bill that suggests going

37:46

through the parks amendments minor amendments and major amendments and then the climate amendments minor and major

37:52

then we've got these two um new ones from commissioners

37:58

and then finally we need to look at the parks and open space element

38:03

um I'm happy to stick with this plan I'm also happy to just go through the draft

38:08

and look at things uh piece by piece for some of these specific things people had questions about um but maybe we should

38:16

start with just trying to get the minor amendments out of the way I see a hand

38:24

commisso um just a quick question so um you sent out an email indicating that

38:32

chair Murphy found a number of places where we needed to make corrections to

38:37

update um I just trying to pull in the Amendments that you all voted on last time do those have any impact on one two

38:46

three and four of your list here they do not okay they were completely separate from that um they just happen to be in

38:53

the same document that's fine I just wanted to make sure that we weren't trying to to also incorporate or reincorporate those or yeah yeah I just

39:01

wanted to get them in here so that you know we don't lose them and we can car if there's any additional amendments tonight we can carry that all forward in

39:07

a clean

39:13

way all right I'm going to switch

39:20

over to

39:36

I don't know if that worked I'm GNA stop sharing it's

39:42

not the controls in Zoom have changed slightly and I'm struggling all right

39:48

stop

40:07

there you are

40:13

okay so this is the tables

40:19

from Planning Commission bill and it's outlining the minor changes Rel related

40:28

to parks and does anybody have any comments

40:33

or questions about

40:40

those Carolyn I just thought I would make a motion to adopt the minor amendments

40:48

that have been proposed by staff for the land use element uh under

40:54

Parks second

41:00

okay motion's been moved and seconded uh do we have any discussion Chris did you

41:06

have something other than discussion of these no I was going to raise a point on

41:12

15.4 that's okay I'm confused why we still have the word single family in

41:18

15.4 seem like we took it out of 15.1 and you know I'm not sure I guess

41:24

I'm not understanding why we would include it there

41:32

I think um the reason for my perspective was

41:39

because in the code those R zones are still referred to as single family zones

41:46

and that is where these clubs and schools and religious

41:52

institutions are typically located they typically have our zoning

41:58

um I think we could probably choose a different word there that's fine I mean

42:03

I don't think it's a big deal I just struck me that the residential areas would be broad enough to include single family residential areas and sort of

42:10

move us toward a a world that's more aligned with the world we're gonna be I think we could say residentially zoned

42:15

areas and it would mean the same thing I would take that as a friendly

42:21

Amendment or an amendment whatever you want to call it does that need a second or

42:36

what well we can uh we don't have our parliamentarian

42:42

here so we might have to wing it I mean if we're just looking for consensus on

42:49

this I think we can go with head nods or no one raising an objection

42:55

yeah well I don't think we should change

43:01

it and commissioner accuse has had her hand up

43:07

so yeah I just had a a very minor point to the original motion offering a friendly Amendment
um that we probably

43:16

need to say including 1910 as amended because we changed the language

43:22

of 1910 corre right let's just carry that over here so we changed it to say

43:28

support conservation on yeah

43:33

thanks and uh regarding 154 um again I'm concerned about

43:41

um word smithing without having the actual um code definitions in front of

43:48

us I like I I appreciate it it's more me like it means something to me like it's

43:53

easier to read and understand the way with the um with the word smithing um I think it

44:01

will be more accurate in the future however we have what we have right now

44:07

um and so creating new terms that might have def different definitions I don't know

44:13

it just feels awkward I want just don't maybe just flag that for consistency if if there's

44:19

agreement to change it

44:26

Victor I'm reading 154 and I uh maybe

44:31

it's just my read of this but this does not feel minor this feels actually rather

44:39

significant just to be clear the underline and strike out here is what the commission previously reviewed um 18

44:47

months or so ago when we initially reviewed the land use element so what's the minor change then um combining so

44:57

up until this last sentence this existed in another it was

45:03

under goal 17 and this last sentence was under goal

45:08

20 we didn't change the wording we just combined them and put them into 15 because 15 is the goal that talks about

45:15

the single family residential

45:22

areas so there were no wording changes proposed it was just combining these two

45:28

pieces and putting them in a different spot that was the minor

45:36

change Andie um I have been tracking this fine

45:44

item and it is not new it's been in our plan for a long time as Allison

45:49

indicated um and I just really do want to caution us from getting editorial in

45:56

places where we where it's existed it's pointing to a very specific Zone in a land use policy

46:04

and a code that has a specific terminology um related to single family

46:09

zoning this is talking to this is talking about facilities within single

46:14

family zones um so there's specificity that has existed and needs to continue to exist

46:21

in order for the city to manage the properties so I'm not in support of making any changes to this at the this

46:28

time bris yeah you I just raised the issue I'm perfectly happy to leave it alone so let's just go back to what it

46:35

was okay so we're back to the original motion and that is to approve the minor

46:42

amendments do we have any discussion or over the other two that are listed

46:54

there okay should do uh Alison would you prefer just consensus on that or a vote

47:03

well since we had a motion let's just do a vote on the motion okay Adam can you call the

47:11

role yeah can you read the motion again please sure it is adopt the minor

47:17

amendments to the park policies as proposed by staff and amended

47:27

um and that was moved by Bozman and seconded by

47:33

bazo um commissioner acuse hi commissioner bazo

47:41

I commissioner bman hi commissioner gals hi commissioner RIS

47:49

hi and commission and chair Murphy hi

47:55

okay sorry what was that hi okay uh motion

48:03

passes Alison okay um next we'll be moving on to the major Amendment for

48:09

Parks which was omitting those 10

48:15

policies um other than the three that we just

48:20

moved to other locations Carolyn

48:27

about those those that were omitted um I thought I read in the staff memo that

48:33

they were moved but then when I looked to see where they were moved to I didn't see where they were moved to so they

48:39

were they were omitted if it said moved it was a typo we had initially considered moving these into the um

48:47

parks and open space element and then upon further consideration felt that that subject matter was well covered in

48:53

the pros plan didn't want to have duplication or different of something

48:59

that was yeah thank you I've just momentarily confused for a

49:15

moment okay any further discussion of the change to 20.1 to 20.13

49:27

okay all in favor should thumbs up

49:37

okay okay great um so let's move on to the climate policies in the land

49:43

element um they're kind of the minor amendments are split in this chart there's one at the top and two at the

49:50

bottom um I think we already talked about these

49:55

to some ENT um updating wording in 21.3

50:00

and 28.1 um goal 28 is struck omitted

50:07

because it's that topic was moved up to goal 26 and this new language was

50:14

drafted so what we're looking for is just approval of these three minor

50:20

changes okay any discussion of those changes

50:26

okay seeing none do we have consensus on

50:32

those okay great um and then for the major climate amendments um it adds the

50:39

new goal 26 and then the two new policies related

50:45

to adopting a climate element as directed by state law and the

50:51

growth management act and that'll need to happen by 2029 and then it adds the second policy

50:58

adopting in the climate action plan by reference any

51:05

discussion okay seeing none oh Angie I just want to make one comment and it is

51:14

Broad um one of the things I notice is that there is a vacillation between when

51:21

we reference trying to make improvements or do things for residents of or Island

51:27

versus when we try and do things for people I do think language is important

51:33

overall and I think it would be important for all of us to start practicing language that's highly

51:39

inclusive where we're referencing people whether they live on the island or not so whether we're making climate change

51:45

adjustments Parks Parks adjustments or so forth um the I found the language

51:51

more in Parks than I did in climate but what I recognize is sometimes where we talk about making making improvements or

51:57

doing comp plan things for residents of Mercer Island when in fact as a municipality where we're serving more

52:04

than just our residents that we practice a language of inclusivity where we're shifting that

52:11

for residents to for people it's a broad comment it's not a make the com make the

52:17

changes here but I just want to put that on record is something I'm starting to notice more and would like to see us

52:24

practice more about shifting when we're referencing who we're doing things for

52:29

that to the extent that we can include it just for people not just residents that's

52:36

important yeah good

52:42

point

52:48

okay

52:53

next any more issues on any of this besides the two amendments uh Chris and

52:59

I

53:05

have okay Alison you want to move to those yeah I'm gonna stop sharing this

53:12

and bring up the actual draft

53:27

um let's see

53:33

find this lives

53:41

in

53:47

27 go put it

53:53

in so commissioner G's is proposing

53:58

adding a sub policy here under promote an energy efficient built environment um

54:05

by reducing greenhouse gas emissions from the construction Heating and Cooling of residential structures by

54:11

encouraging smaller single family residential housing units moderate density housing including duplexes and

54:18

triplexes and the use of Green Building Materials and techniques all right Chris yeah I was

54:25

just going to say I mean the you know the go 27 has reduced CommunityWide greenhouse gas emissions

54:31

you know the I think the the emissions in the building and the cooling and

54:36

heating of uh the built environment in Mercer Island and you know a lot in the residential side is maybe our biggest uh

54:44

contributor to uh to greenhouse gas emissions and so I think it's an odd Omission that uh we haven't said

54:50

something and it would be to my mind a a good idea to put a a policy placeholder

54:56

here so that uh we have it on

55:04

record any other thoughts

55:09

Carolyn yeah I was really excited to see this policy uh introduced because throughout the work

55:16

on the housing element and the climate element we really don't have this anywhere in policy the climate action

55:24

plan does not talk that I could find anywhere about the size of

55:31

structures being related to climate emissions or that we should have any

55:36

particular thoughts about the size of structures let alone encourag doing anything about it so I'm very pleased to

55:44

see this include encouraging smaller single family residences encouraging

55:49

moderate density and encouraging the use of Green Building Materials um so I I think it's really

55:57

good I I'm pleased to see the sort of the update of the draft policy from where I first saw it um I just have one

56:04

question Allison do we address again the Green Building Materials and techniques

56:10

do we have that somewhere else already that I mean it's nice to have it all in

56:15

one spot I don't mind repeating it because it's it's got the context but there is a section up above that's

56:22

specifically about Green Building and so there's a few policies related to encouraging Green Building

56:31

um so I think it it's okay to have this have that here too yeah particularly

56:38

because it relates it to the reduction of greenhouse gases right yeah so I think it's a really good policy I I like

56:44

it I'm I'm in favor any other

56:53

comments um I would just make the comment uh I think this is a a really

56:58

good way to introduce this uh especially with the language in the latest draft

57:04

about encouraging um smaller housing and you

57:10

know I I think the more you listen to uh things and read things about you

57:16

know sources of greenhouse gases you realize that the single family residence

57:23

is a huge contributor uh and we should be working to try to reduce that to the

57:31

extent possible um now I want since Adam's not here I want to give voice to

57:38

his concerns as expressed in his email and and I initially shared some of

57:44

Adam's concerns to a degree as it related to the original language but the

57:49

most recent version eliminates the notion of the limiting language uh and

57:54

instead encourages certain activity and policies that we will ultimately have to

57:59

comply with now people are still free to build adequate multi-generational homes

58:06

um but I don't think this proposal is designed to require um or even encourage only

58:14

two-bedroom 1.5 bath homes as Adam pointed out I I think that's a bit of a

58:21

straw man um I think that you know what motivates this and what concerned many

58:27

people is that um you know we've got 5,000 foot houses with two adults and

58:34

one or two children in them and uh that's that's not really for

58:39

multigenerational living um and houses of that nature truly have an outsized

58:45

impact on climate change at many levels both from construction to operation so I

58:52

think the uh I think the introducing this policy here is a good one and uh I

58:58

support it

59:04

okay all right thanks yeah I was just gonna say that I do support the policy

59:09

and um I read and considered Mr Rab's note as well and um I thought it was

59:16

interesting um my my experience with most um multi-generational families

59:23

uh in in the actual International communities he might be referencing is

59:28

that they live in apartments and and they're very small relative to the large homes that are being built on Mercer

59:35

Island um so I agree with you chair Murphy that um it's the SI the size of the house

59:42

does not need to be 5,000 square feet to have a multigenerational family there are plenty of multigenerational families

59:49

living in 2,000 square foot Apartments all over the world um it's a a gigantic

59:55

house is more of a status symbol than a than a a need of an international family so it it it it struck me um kind of H I

1:00:06

don't know I it made me think too that like um housing policies that are meant

1:00:11

to address race and social justice they're um they're not meant to address

1:00:17

race and social justice for folks who have high incomes they're meant to address waste and social

1:00:23

justice for folks who have been dis franchised by historically um racist

1:00:29

policies so it just it struck a foul note with me um the notion that large

1:00:35

houses um small houses prevented multigenerational living um it it seemed

1:00:40

almost like abusive of the concept of race and social

1:00:47

justice yeah I on a personal not I found it somewhat amusing because um when I

1:00:53

was a child my grandmother lived with us so I grew up in a multi-generational household um and the

1:01:01

house was 2100 Square ft and there were four children two adults and one

1:01:06

grandmother so uh and we thought it was

1:01:13

huge so um yeah I don't know if it struck it struck me more as am musing

1:01:20

than as a sour note but um I understood his point and and uh but

1:01:27

it was it was uh didn't didn't really resonate very much so any other

1:01:36

comments okay on that note uh should we

1:01:42

uh do we need a vote on this Alison or do we do a thumbs up or thumbs up would

1:01:48

be fine okay all right

1:01:56

and then Victor do you want to vote or would you block consensus on that I did

1:02:02

vote I was thumbs down yeah we didn't do a formal vote though that's fine

1:02:09

okay okay I'm going to move on to policy

1:02:22

17.3 chair Murphy has proposed this wording change from minimize to

1:02:31

mitigate um let me comment on that Angie and then I'll let you talk um that kind

1:02:37

of jumped out at me this time um um as I read through it and the reason it jumped

1:02:43

out at me is that usually in things like this the term of art especially in um

1:02:50

land use and sepa is mitigation not minimization

1:02:56

um and it's not clear what minimize would really mean there uh and so I just

1:03:02

thought a um M whereas mitigate and mitigation is a very commonly used term

1:03:09

in that context and so I felt that um that was really more appropriate and it

1:03:14

can certainly Encompass uh minimization uh but it covers a broader

1:03:21

range of of factors uh Angie you were

1:03:28

first thanks um okay so as a practitioner who uses the words minimize

1:03:35

and mitigate um to bludgeon my counterparts um I will readily

1:03:42

acknowledge that to minimize something has very specific context both in sepa

1:03:48

NEPA and other conditions versus mitigate when we minimize we take

1:03:53

specific actions to reduce the actual impact of said um event when we mitigate we

1:04:01

recognize that we cannot reduce the impact and therefore we have to offer

1:04:06

something alternative to reducing the impact um oftentimes in places where

1:04:13

this has been applied uh can sometimes result in paid like we are paying

1:04:18

mitigation in the form of XY or Z mitigation and minimization are two very

1:04:24

different distinctions and that puts the city in a pretty specific

1:04:31

position as a practitioner when I seek to mitigate something I get something

1:04:36

that I Define because you're trading the impact for the result as a minimization the

1:04:44

city has some control over being able to take the impact and make it less than

1:04:50

and so that wording is pretty specific and I think we need to be mindful about where where we're placing it uh I'm not

1:04:56

saying one or the other not saying I'd vote up or down I am saying we have to be mindful about the word we're actually

1:05:02

using because minimize versus m uh mitigate is something super

1:05:09

specific um that I use pretty frequently in my own

1:05:15

practice uh let's see Carolyn I think you were second okay well I think both

1:05:20

of you made terrific points and um I'm causing my thinking to progress it

1:05:27

begins to seem safer for the city to minimize the impacts in terms of how we

1:05:34

review and approve the development whereas if we say we're going to mitigate it it seems

1:05:42

like that might yeah I don't know it might put us

1:05:48

on the hook for things that could be expansive that are hard to Define I'm

1:05:53

that's all I can say I I don't have any any further clarification on that I'm not quite sure how to

1:06:01

vote hey yeah I appreciate the comment so far

1:06:08

um thank you for recognizing me chair um so yeah in in in our practice we have a

1:06:15

phrase called uh in environmental regulations we have a phrase called the

1:06:20

mitigation sequencing and there's an order of things you try to avoid then you minimize then you

1:06:26

mitigate and you want to you want to avoid mitigating if you can because mitigating can be very expensive when I

1:06:32

read the word mitigate I was thinking of um all the times I've applied for permits uh as a government institution

1:06:40

and folks in the community have claimed it was a takings to do the project so I

1:06:46

think there's I I agree with uh commissioner bazo that there's a financial implication for the city and

1:06:52

some potential exposure for the city to use the word mitigate um so I would I would propose that we um

1:07:01

if we want to make an edit here that we would say that avoid and minimize and leave mitigate out of

1:07:11

it uh Victor so I I kind of

1:07:18

share commissioner boatman's sentiments and I'm having a hard time getting my head around this a little bit so I'm

1:07:24

wondering if either chairman Murphy or commissioner Vaso just give me a an example

1:07:32

of how we would mitigate versus minimize here just so I can give me a way to

1:07:40

think about okay right do I get to call on chair commissioner bazo she's raising

1:07:45

her hand sure sure go ahead Andie yeah um so I'm going to qualify this

1:07:52

discussion by saying this is just Angie be talking in her practice um and and

1:07:59

I'm building off of what commissioner qes talked about which is standard practice in the state of Washington and

1:08:05

any municipality under a certain set of environmental rules avoid minimize and

1:08:10

mitigate and this is actually a great Point as to why I actually didn't like

1:08:16

this the edit that we added especially residential zones Victor you're going to appreciate this I didn't like it I

1:08:23

thumbs downed it when we added that and I'll explain to you why when government

1:08:29

takes an action that has an impact okay it has to assess that impact and it has

1:08:35

to decide if that impact Rises to the level of is it

1:08:42

minimiz can we do things to make it less of an impact not just to residences but

1:08:48

to businesses to economy and to government not just to residences but

1:08:54

also to businesses economy and government it has to assess that impact

1:09:00

okay if it decides that the impact is such that they can't minimize it by

1:09:06

putting up so for example we're going to do something really loud we're going to do it for three weeks is there a way

1:09:12

that we can make that really loud thing not so loud to somebody if we can make

1:09:18

it not so loud that's called a minimization so we put a giant foam wall

1:09:24

up and we make the thing not as loud to everybody else so it's loud inside the

1:09:29

foam wall but outside the foam wall that's a minimization impact if we have to do a very loud

1:09:37

thing it's beyond what's loud for the world the environment and we can't put a big foam wall up we might have to

1:09:45

mitigate to mitigate might mean um I've got to pay for you to relocate your

1:09:51

business or your house or your sleeping arrangements or some variety of things

1:09:56

that we have to negotiate I might have to mitigate by doing something because I'm going to do the loud thing to get

1:10:02

that thing done and you have to deal with it and we have to come to some agreement via mitigation minimization is

1:10:11

I have an impact but I can make it less feelable to you because I can put up

1:10:17

things or I can do something that you don't notice as it at much mitigation is

1:10:23

I'm going to do the thing and there's nothing I can do to make that thing more impactful to you and so now I have to do

1:10:30

something different to make it up to you that's what mitigation is and it's not just here we say we added at our last

1:10:38

meeting especially residential zones and I was annoyed because businesses get

1:10:44

impacted by construction businesses lose economy by construction at various

1:10:50

levels jurisdictions lose tax revenue when businesses lose economy and so

1:10:56

there's an important mitigation system there that we have to consider so it's not just especially residents it's the

1:11:04

economy too and so when we say avoid we have to avoid the impact when we say

1:11:10

minimize we need to minimize that impact I need to take the loud noise or the

1:11:16

diversion of traffic or the thing that might seem really substantial and I need to make it less that's called a void if

1:11:23

I can't avoid it like the tunnel in downtown Seattle we had to build a

1:11:28

tunnel and we had to take down a Viaduct and that had a massive traffic impact

1:11:34

that we could not change because we could not put cars someplace else so so

1:11:40

do had to mitigate they had to pay for ways to make that less

1:11:47

impactful those are very distinct categories that apply to not just

1:11:52

residents but it applies to businesses it applies to economy it applies to

1:12:01

government I appreciate the explanation

1:12:07

so can I ask a follow on to that you sure can can

1:12:12

of Bas and and I guess this is is more of a question for chair Murphy but but also

1:12:21

commissioner bazo but I'm GNA ask of chair Murphy because he's the one he's the one proposing

1:12:27

this why is this either or why isn't it minimize or mitigate that's what I took

1:12:34

away from the explanation that commissioner bazo just

1:12:39

gave did I misunderstand no so I I think I I agree

1:12:46

with with basically everything Angie said um the difference here and

1:12:53

and what I think we're highlighting is the use of

1:12:59

a use of alternative or potentially alternative terms of

1:13:04

art um where they may not belong um and that could be the core

1:13:14

problem here that I was trying to deal with and uh I think and you have

1:13:20

succinctly crystallized for me what jumped out of me here and why I

1:13:29

suggested that other language um I think we're really looking

1:13:34

for something you know we're talking here about code change making code changes

1:13:41

we're not talking about building tunnels um and and while there is certainly some

1:13:47

overlap in the sea review process um because both new regulations and tunnels

1:13:55

Bridges Etc go through sea the impacts and the analysis are quite different uh

1:14:02

sea review of new regulations is pretty cursory um and so I was looking for the

1:14:10

more um benign use of the term uh mitigate whereas min minimize could seem

1:14:19

fairly Draconian or could be interpreted as fairly Draconian so I think that

1:14:24

we're looking for potentially another term here to get away from what I think

1:14:30

are really um if they're used as terms of art here could be problematic uh

1:14:38

Kate yeah thank thanks for recognizing M chair um I I'm GNA propose that we

1:14:45

replace instead of with mitigate I'm going to propose that we replace with

1:14:50

the word consider um I am working on some sea

1:14:55

non-project actions right now which is when you're doing sea for a planning

1:15:01

document as opposed to construction project um and and those words just

1:15:07

apply to um you know Alternatives analysis and how you're gonna what kind of practices you're going to use to to

1:15:15

deal with impacts so um I think we should avoid this language Al together I appreciate your U mention of that chair

1:15:21

Murphy and I would propose that we uh strike minimizes you suggest and use the

1:15:27

word consider instead yeah I I I think that's probably

1:15:34

a better way to do it Carolyn um I was just trying to consider

1:15:41

what Kate had just proposed so then that says changes in zoning regulations that

1:15:50

consider adverse effects effects to surrounding areas

1:15:55

I'm not sure what that would mean in terms of doing anything just to consider it but I have an alternative suggestion

1:16:03

for the language if I may run that out there since we're just talking Alternatives here would that be all

1:16:09

right K sure there's no motion there's no

1:16:14

motion pending so go ahead okay so as considering the differences between

1:16:19

minimize and mitigate and the risks associated with both of those and also

1:16:26

um the comment that we shouldn't just be thinking residential zones because these impacts are to any number of land uses

1:16:35

so I would have a proposal for rewarding this and I would just I can just read to you how I would suggest wording it add

1:16:42

multifam residential and other commercial uses to the commercial office

1:16:48

zones this should be accomplished through changes in zoning that seek to

1:16:56

minimize adverse impacts to surrounding areas

1:17:06

period so that would just you know mean that you you try you try to minimize

1:17:11

impacts but we are under orders from state government to put in this kind of housing you know what is an impact is a

1:17:18

matter of opinion so I mean I think the best we can do is seek to minimize

1:17:25

you know that would be a way to possibly deal with

1:17:31

this uh Kate before before I go sorry I lost a l

1:17:38

lost an earbud there um I was gonna propose a motion just to just to get

1:17:44

things moving did you want to say something before that chair Murphy yeah um I

1:17:51

wanted to ask Carolyn um she seemed to dropped the word regulations out of the

1:17:57

language she had was that intentional no I'm sorry I I didn't see that no thank

1:18:03

you zoning regulations I meant to include that yeah okay um let me go to

1:18:09

Angie Kate first I think her hand was up um I think I just want to acknowledge

1:18:15

to my fellow Commissioners and practitioners and I may get this wrong in some ways but
it's approximately

1:18:22

accurate um our policy here that we're putting in our comprehensive plan does

1:18:27

not supersede NEPA or sepa or actual review by any developer or anybody who's

1:18:33

going to take action so um that avoid minimize mitigate

1:18:41

pattern that both commissioner cues and I referenced will be in effect

1:18:48

regardless of what we do here I do think it's important for us to choose the right words but
for those of us who are

1:18:54

worried about making sure that we're not shorting zones or businesses or

1:19:00

residents or areas of the ability to be protected by sepa and NEPA are both very

1:19:06

robust practices that get uh engaged frequently that you won't miss out on I

1:19:13

just think it's good for us to choose language that's both consistent um and meaningful and not put

1:19:20

the city on the hook for where NEPA and SE are going to hold the city and developers and others feet to the fire

1:19:27

on following through with that so I just want to make sure we all know uh by not putting that language in

1:19:33

we're not shorting anybody the language is robust in other places and works um

1:19:40

so I just want to make that note here uh

1:19:47

Kate um I I I continue to want to avoid using the term minimize um so

1:19:55

um I guess I'll put my motion out on the table and we can just vote on it so my motion would be

1:20:01

to um strike minimize use the word consider

1:20:06

and then drop especially residential zones because I agree that um business

1:20:13

impacts are extremely important and there are a number of businesses down there um and they serve Children and

1:20:21

Families they're really important businesses to our community so

1:20:27

yeah I propose this amendment okay moved and seconded

1:20:33

further discussion Carolyn oh I'm I'm sorry no I meant to put my hand down

1:20:39

thank you any other comments Kate ER okay um

1:20:49

yeah I I would support that motion um

1:20:57

okay Adam you want to call the role there yeah uh commissioner accuse

1:21:05

hi uh commissioner bazo I commissioner Bozman I commissioner gals I

1:21:14

commissioner RI n and and chair Murphy I okay motion

1:21:22

passes okay okay um that concludes the changes

1:21:30

to the land use element um let me pull up that Parks

1:21:35

element really quick and I think that's the final thing that we need to look at

1:21:52

yeah all right fits all in one

1:22:00

page um so I think I kind of covered what this includes previously it's that

1:22:06

goal brought over from land use element goal 20 and then the two new

1:22:12

policies to adopt the pros plan and state Our intention to adopt the open

1:22:18

space Zone and park zone

1:22:27

I think if there's no comments or questions we just need consensus to approve this as

1:22:39

drafted Kate are you a thumbs

1:22:52

down you can't hear you sorry I I I have to switch between too

1:23:00

many Microsoft accounts if I use the big computer so I I'm doing these meetings

1:23:05

on my phone and that means I have to bring my thumbs in to adjust these I'm

1:23:10

really sorry it's probably distracting but no I'm a thumbs up okay thumbs up

1:23:16

all right okay Alison all right um that is it for the

1:23:23

Amendments we need to review tonight I did have a quick go back to my

1:23:29

PowerPoint um just update on scheduling and stuff that I wanted to go over quick and

1:23:35

then Adam is going to talk a little bit about the open

1:23:41

house all right so just a quick fly over of the

1:23:49

next couple months um as you all know the open house is scheduled May 1st from 6 to

1:23:55

8 um on May 8th the Parks and Recreation Commission and open space trust board

1:24:01

will be sending their recommendation on the open space Zone and also land use

1:24:06

map amendments to align with that um I believe the chairs from each of those

1:24:12

boards will be in attendance to present their recommendation and then the following to

1:24:19

Wednesdays May 15th and 22nd um we will be considering what we're calling the

1:24:25

tuneup of the drafts after the openhouse and Survey After we receive the input

1:24:32

from the open house and the survey you'll have a chance to review that and make additional amendments as needed to

1:24:39

address all that comment um in advance of the public hearing which is scheduled for May

1:24:45

29th so that's when we'll get any formal public comment

1:24:51

um whether that's you know verbal or in and then we've got three dates held in

1:24:58

June for the final review and amendments bringing in any consistency amendments

1:25:05

anything based on the public hearing Etc um I think we can hone in on whether we

1:25:11

need all three of those meetings once we get a little closer and can understand

1:25:16

how much we might need to be considering at that time um but I'd say Mark those dates down June 19th is not included

1:25:23

because that's a holiday and we're aiming to complete

1:25:30

review by June 26 which is coming right

1:25:35

up all right that's all for me okay the third and final item of special

1:25:43

business is Planning Commission agenda Bill PCB 248 comp plan update Community

1:25:50

Workshop preparation welcome Adam thank you um let me share my screen here

1:25:58

I've just got a quick slide deck to um going to help you guys get ready

1:26:04

for um the um oh Zoom did change everything um

1:26:11

to get ready for our comp plan open house that we're planning uh for May

1:26:16

1st um so the the comp plan openhouse will be a 2hour event uh where we'll

1:26:23

have STS where the public can engage with the material that you all have been working on for the last two years now um

1:26:31

the comp plan update um they'll be able to see um some summaries of each of the

1:26:38

elements and then also we'll have at some of those stations particularly for housing and economic development uh

1:26:45

we'll have some exercises at those stations to to gather some input um on

1:26:51

um on those topics um this will also be paired with an online

1:26:57

survey um so we'll have a another feedback mechanism so the folks that are

1:27:03

there if they want to dive a little deeper or provide a little more detailed input they can they can do that through

1:27:08

the survey um and that'll be kind of bundled together with our um the input

1:27:16

that we get at the open house um and really we wanted to hold this open house at this stage in the plan uh planning

1:27:23

process so that we can engage the public you can have an opportunity to engage with uh

1:27:30

the public in advance of the public Hearing in in a way that is maybe a little bit more engaging than the public

1:27:37

hearing where folks get up they have three minutes and that's kind of it um so we wanted to give you a chance to get

1:27:44

um a little closer to the public in that way um this is also a great chance um to

1:27:50

to report out all of the work that we've been doing for the last 2 years um and get um usually at these events we

1:27:58

get a lot of folks that have have no idea what's going on have never heard about the comp plan and and don't know

1:28:04

that we've been working on it for that time so it's it's a good good opportunity to to get the word out in

1:28:10

that way um we're planning on this from 6:00 pm to 8:00 pm on May 1st um and then as

1:28:19

Allison just mentioned we'll be going through a tuneup process with the comp plan update um through the second half

1:28:25

of May uh to get you ready for your public hearing and you know part of the

1:28:31

idea again is so that we can get the public uh comments addressed prior to

1:28:37

holding that public hearing and that should take some of the weight off of that one um off of that public hearing

1:28:43

um give you a chance to feel like you really responded to the public input we get um the open house will be held at

1:28:51

the Mercer Island community and Event Center in the Mercer room um that's the big room just to the right of the um of

1:28:59

the lobby there um and then and we're inviting everybody um on the Planning

1:29:04

Commission here to attend um we're encouraging you to attend um as I mentioned this is a good opportunity to

1:29:11

um engage with the public um and and hear some perspectives that maybe um we

1:29:18

haven't heard um through this process yet um and then staff will be on hand at the open house to help field some of

1:29:25

those questions um and then um give a little bit more of that like technical

1:29:30

background um at the open house so Adam what um what's meant by

1:29:39

exercises while we're still in the process of of getting those designed um

1:29:44

a lot of times uh you know we've been we've been trying to figure out good ways to get some input on implementation

1:29:52

so whether that's some kind of dot exercise or um you know prioritization

1:29:59

providing their prioritization of certain implementation actions um that's

1:30:04

where we're trying to direct some of that um and have those those exercises so you know if you're a big fan of you

1:30:12

know our proposed code amendment process to um make it easier for um small

1:30:20

businesses to um expand you could you could say do this first um that that

1:30:26

kind of thing but the exact exercises are still um in the Pro in the design

1:30:33

process and what are you expecting Commissioners to be doing

1:30:41

while we're there um so we don't have any uh specific

1:30:47

expectations um in terms of it you know so if you come and you want to say you

1:30:54

served on the economic development workg group and wanted to hear folks input on the economic development element you

1:31:01

could you could hang out at that station you you can engage with um the folks that sto by there um ask questions you

1:31:09

can just kind of roam around and hear the comments at the different stations it's really up to you um we don't have

1:31:15

any like specific you you won't be making a presentation or anything like that um and um I also wanted to take

1:31:23

this opportunity to uh let you guys know that um you know staff will be available or

1:31:30

is available leading up to the event if you have questions about um you know

1:31:36

where did we really end up with this part of the comp plan you can reach out to either Allison or myself and we can

1:31:42

kind of get you up to speed or uh refresh your memory um so we're we're

1:31:48

around if if you need um additional assistance leading up to it and we'll uh communicate the day of will be available

1:31:55

the day of kind of ahead of the the event um if you if you want to come a

1:32:00

little early um too um but really the expectation is just to come and listen

1:32:06

and um you know hear that um hear what the the public has to say um and then I

1:32:13

provided a link here to where we have the um the public review drafts of all

1:32:18

of the elements uh posted on the project website um so those are available if you

1:32:24

want to review those in advance of the um of the workshop as well um I see

1:32:29

Carolyn you have your hand up yeah will the planning Commissioners be identified

1:32:35

in any particular way when we are at this event will we be wearing a little

1:32:40

placard that says I'm a planning commissioner or something like that we'll have name tags
yeah okay uh you we

1:32:47

we'll provide those yeah okay if there's one thing you can rely on at a at a

1:32:53

Community Workshop it would be name tags being available yeah um we'll have a sign in
sheet too

1:33:00

okay um all right um let's see so uh Alison really already kind of touched on

1:33:06

this um our our next steps where we're where we're heading from here um all of

1:33:12

this is working toward that May 29th public hearing um and a aiming to get

1:33:19

that recommendation wrapped up by the end of June

1:33:24

um I I see commissioner accuse has her hand up yeah I just um sorry if this sounds a

1:33:32

little obnoxious but I'm wondering if you have security plans for the May 1

1:33:38

event I'm hearkening back to the Sound Transit meeting um where they brought

1:33:44

Light Rail to us initially and they were number very aggressive Folks at that

1:33:49

meeting that were um uh spoke in some interesting ways to staff that I think made a lot of people residents included

1:33:56

very uncomfortable um so sometimes I I think with these public meetings where you're

1:34:02

talking about something that may be controversial um such as the housing element um it's good to make sure the

1:34:08

uh um the PD is aware and maybe has somebody there some presence can be

1:34:14

helpful to uh keep people from getting

1:34:21

aggressive that's a a good point I don't we haven't talked about that specifically yet I see Allison just

1:34:27

jumped on here so yeah I was just going to say we hadn't that hadn't come to mind for us yet but it is something the

1:34:34

city takes seriously there's back when we had you know real inperson City

1:34:39

Council meetings prior to covid there was always police presence at a city council meeting um and it's certainly

1:34:47

something we can consider for this meeting and I'll I'll talk that over with other folks within the city and see

1:34:53

if we think it's warranted thank

1:34:59

you um so that that concludes my presentation I'm happy to answer answer any other questions you may have

1:35:07

um yeah I just want to make one final pitch

1:35:15

to staff about anytime you guys are doing the cleanup and update and places

1:35:21

where you can shift from the language of residence to people um to the extent

1:35:27

that it doesn't substantially change things but you guys can do that I just

1:35:32

want to continue to encourage that as it relates to the language of inclusivity and starts shifting us into

1:35:40

thinking about Mercer Island as its place in the broader

1:35:51

context definitely noting that down

1:35:59

yeah okay now we move on to other business uh Allison is there any other

1:36:06

deputy director report for tonight no I think I covered everything previously in

1:36:12

the presentation so I'm all set okay any planned absences for future Chris yeah

1:36:20

I'm going to be out of the country from April 28th to May 23rd so I think the next time I will see

1:36:27

you all at the public hearing good travel

1:36:34

safely send us postcards you know I I did join you from uh Ecuador because

1:36:40

only two hours time difference but nine hours I think puts the meetings at 3 or 4 am so I'm just not sure that's going

1:36:45

to work so then postcards all right you got it

1:36:51

okay um I'm not sure what the Little League schedule is

1:36:56

yet I don't think we're winning the championship this year but um I've had to miss most of my son's games with this

1:37:03

uh very aggressive schedule for the comp plan and um there's a playoff game put

1:37:11

on the schedule I might be reaching out to you via email it's

1:37:19

okay any other thoughts for the good of the order

1:37:25

okay has an yet another reminder the open house is May 1 at 6: pm at the

1:37:33

community center uh and the next special meeting is scheduled for Wednesday May 8 at 6:

1:37:41

p.m. uh there being no other business to come before the Planning Commission the time is now

1:37:48

739 p.m. and the meeting is adjourned as a reminder please stay online until

1:37:55

staff has terminated the broadcast good evening and thank you for joining us

1:38:00

thank you chair you're welcome