

RENTON PLANNING COMMISSION
Meeting Minutes

June 15, 2011
6:00 p.m.

Renton City Hall
Conferencing Center

Planning Commissioners Present: Michael Drollinger, Ray Giometti, Gwendolyn High, Michael O'Halloran, Nancy Osborn, Ed Prince, Martin Regge

Planning Commissioners Absent: Michael Chen, Kevin Poole

City Staff Present: Chip Vincent, Planning Director; Vanessa Dolbee, Senior Planner

1. CALL TO ORDER: Commission Vice Chair Drollinger called the meeting to order at 6:02 p.m.
2. ROLL CALL: Commission Secretary O'Halloran called roll. Commission Chair Prince arrived late. Commissioners Chen and Poole were absent and excused.
3. CORRESPONDENCE RECEIVED: None
4. AUDIENCE COMMENTS: None
5. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS: None
6. DIRECTOR'S REPORT:
 - Chip thanked the Commissioners that were able to participate in the Walkability Audit in the Benson Community last week. It was a success and Staff is waiting for a report from the consultant, which will be shared with the both the Planning Commission and Parks Commission.
7. JOINT PLANNING COMMISSION & PARKS COMMISSION MEETING:
See Attachment A: Parks Commission and Planning Commission Joint Meeting #2.
8. 2011 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN AMENDMENTS (CPA) DELIBERATIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS
 - M-01: Vantage Glen Mobile Home Park
Planning Commission Recommendation
MADE BY OSBORN, SECONDED BY REGGE to accept the staff recommendation. FIVE FOR, ONE AGAINST, TWO ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED.

 - M-05: Barbee Mill
Planning Commission Recommendation
MADE BY REGGE, SECONDED BY DROLLINGER to take no action and the zoning and land use should remain COR. Staff should conduct more analysis on the greater area, including Barbee Mill, for next year's cycle. SIX FOR, TWO ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED.

RENTON. AHEAD OF THE CURVE.

City of
Renton
Community & Economic Development



June 15, 2011

M-06: Duvall

Planning Commission Recommendation

MADE BY GIOMETTI, SECONDED BY OSBORN to accept the staff recommendation. FIVE FOR, ONE ABSTAIN, TWO ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED.

T-01: Sustainability; T-02: GMA Review; T-03: Transportation Element; T-04: Complete Streets; T-05: Economic Development; T-06: Landscaping; T-07: Assisted Living Density Bonus; and T-08: City Center Plan
Planning Commission Recommendation

MADE BY GIOMETTI, SECONDED BY OSBORN to accept the staff recommendation. SIX FOR, TWO ABSENT. MOTION CARRIED.

9. COMMISSIONER COMMENTS: The next Commission meeting will be on July 6, 2011.

10. ADJOURNMENT: The meeting adjourned at 8:43 p.m.

Ed Prince, Chair

Michael Drollinger, Vice Chair

Signed copy available
from City Clerk's Office.

Renew the Legacy... Fulfill the Vision

Renton Parks, Recreation, Open Space
and Natural Resources Plan



Parks Commission and Planning Commission Joint Meeting #2

Date **6/15/2011**

Time **6:00 PM – 7:45 PM**

Location **Renton City Hall, 7th Floor, Conferencing Center (Rm 720)**

Participants

Community Services Administrator: Terry Higashiyama

Team Leads: Leslie Betlach, Vanessa Dolbee

Parks Commission Members: Al Dieckman, Chair; Cynthia Burns, Michael O-Donin, Larry Reymann, Marlene Winter, Troy Wigestrang,

Planning Commission Members: Ed Prince, Chair; Michael Drollinger, Ray Giometti, Gwendolyn High, Michael O'Halloran, Nancy Osborn, Martin Regge

Other Participants: Pete Maas, Kris Sorensen, Chip Vincent

Team Members Unable to Attend: Tim Searing, Michael Chen, Kevin Poole

Consulting Team Members (MIG): Ryan Mottau and Jon Pheanis

Meeting Summary

The second joint meeting with the Renton Parks Commission and Planning Commission for the Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Natural Resources (PROSNR) Plan focused on the outcomes of the public involvement process to include a Draft Preliminary Project List and Draft Preliminary Program List, the vision for the PROSNR Plan and the project and program decision making tools.

Using a PowerPoint presentation, MIG introduced the project and gave an update of the planning process. The presentation included a summary of the Visioning Workshop (including the Visual Preference Survey Results and the Break-out Group Exercise), the on-line Interactive Mapping Exercise and the statistically valid Community Priority Survey.

Community Priority Survey

Following a review of the needs assessment, MIG provided an update of recent public outreach opportunities. These included a community visioning workshop, an online interactive map and a community wide survey. The random sample, statistically significant survey occurred after the workshop and initial public outreach. The survey is critical in testing key findings identified throughout the needs assessment process. Meeting participants provided the following comments, with responses provided by City staff and MIG.

Renton Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Natural Resources Plan

- A meeting participant asked how improving existing sports fields is defined. One of the key findings from the survey is that improving existing facilities is important to residents. The survey question did not specify this definition, but the question was useful in gauging interest between improvements to existing facilities and constructing new ones, such as a new sports field complex.
- A participant asked about youth participation percentage and whether the related survey question specifically asked about youth sports. The youth participation questions did specify participation in youth sports.
- A participant asked about “silent participants” or those of diverse backgrounds that may be underrepresented in the public involvement process but rely on parks and recreation facilities. This issue is especially important in Renton, due to distinctive differences among planning areas. A complete summary of the survey methodology is presented in the Community-wide Survey Summary Report. The survey was conducted in three languages: English, Spanish and Vietnamese. The survey required a five-percentage point difference among different planning areas to indicate a difference from the overall average. The survey demographics very closely matched the 2010 Census demographics.
- Similarly, a participant questioned whether reliance of a phone administered survey would introduce bias due to the percentage of the population that do not have or answer a phone. The survey process included a check on census data to compare whether demographic data is representative of the survey. Survey responses closely matched demographic data.
- A related comment noted that neighborhoods of similar demographics may skew survey results, and that distinguishing among different planning areas would be valuable. The survey relied on a statistically valid sample. A greater sample of demographically diverse neighborhoods would require a more extensive effort which is not possible given the existing project budget.
- One participant asked if any of the results stood out from typical surveys. A response of “no activity” was one finding in the survey, in response to a question about frequent recreation activity. Related to this question, a participant asked whether some survey respondents could interpret walking as utilitarian activity and not necessarily a recreational activity. Such an example would lead these respondents to omit walking as a preferred activity.

Plan Vision

MIG presented the draft community vision for the plan. The draft vision is based on public input generated during the planning process and Community Visioning Workshop. The Inter Departmental Team approved of the draft vision earlier in the month as did the Steering Committee.

Renton Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Natural Resources Plan

Draft Vision: Parks, Recreation and Natural Resource Areas provide the opportunity for the community to connect to, participate in, support and encourage a healthy environment and active lifestyle.

Decision Making Tools

The remainder of the meeting focused on the Decision Making Tools and the Draft Preliminary Project List and Draft Preliminary Program List. MIG presented four draft decision making tools: Recreation Program Evaluation, Design Guidelines, Prioritization Criteria and a Capital and Operations Cost Model. Public input was incorporated into the development of these draft tools. The draft tools were tested at IDT #3 and the previous Steering Committee meeting; based upon input at both of the afore-mentioned meetings minor revisions were incorporated into the draft tools. The recreation program criteria will help the City discuss existing and future recreation programming in the efforts of providing programs that reflect community needs and priorities. A goal for this meeting was to review and discuss the Draft Decision Making Tools in order to identify potential changes to the criteria and review the Draft Preliminary Project List that utilized the draft tools for list development. Specific comments and responses related to the Decision Making Tools are presented below.

Design Guidelines

- Comments indicated that the discussion of non conforming parks (existing sites that do not meet the guidelines) is helpful in determining future direction for these parks. There are several methods that can be used to address parks that do not meet the design guidelines.
- On a related note, a participant stated that certain small parks are desirable amenities because these parks can meet some needs of the community, especially where neighborhoods are underserved by larger parks. One of the survey questions asked about preferences for small or mini parks. Responses showed that residents prefer larger parks (community and neighborhood) with more amenities. However, Jones Park was identified as a popular small park. This site nearly meets size guidelines and is in close proximity to an exiting trail. Sunset Court Park is another example of a small park that is land locked and is near a redeveloping area. Through the Sunset Planed Action, EIS and potential future development, a project is proposed to replace the park site. The redevelopment project would showcase the new park and serve as a model for future development.
- Meeting participants agreed that some parks are popular even though they do not meet guidelines. Glencoe Park is an example of a site that should remain in its current condition as an exception to the guidelines.
- Meeting participants also agreed that existing parks that do not meet the proposed draft guidelines be noted as exceptions and be re-classified to the most appropriate park category and asterisked, as these parks currently provide a valuable function.

Renton Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Natural Resources Plan

- A participant asked about restrictions on conditions for use and development of a park site. If the condition is not clear from the beginning, such restrictions should be identified in the criteria. Similarly, land donations can be weighed against the criteria, identifying whether these sites meet community needs.
- Access is another issue that is important to the community. Improved access is a concept that was mentioned frequently in the public involvement process.

Prioritization Criteria

- Leslie Betlach provided an overview of the preliminary projects and how projects ranked, displaying the list through color coded ranking. A participant asked to provide an existing example of how the criteria can be used. Projects can be adjusted based on additional considerations. As an example, Ron Regis Park and the NARCO property shifted from the initial ranking based on conditions related to the NARCO property. Grant funding utilized to acquire the NARCO property encumbered half of the property for use as open space and cannot be developed, unless the City purchases the equivalent value of land (right to use the land for active recreation use). The likelihood of Ron Regis developing prior to the NARCO property is greater because the site is owned by the City (without restrictions) and therefore ranks higher.
- The majority of top ranked parks are existing parks with developed facilities. This matches the public input showing support for maintenance of existing facilities. The list also reflects support for natural areas and opportunities for youth.
- One participant mentioned that filling gaps in the Benson Area is not listed as a top priority. A participant noted that there is expressed interest about providing a public pool and community center in the Benson Area. Another participant identified a need for new facilities in East Renton. Participants expressed the desire to identify the needs of individual planning areas. However, the project list is intended to show needs across the entire system.
- A meeting participant noted that there is currently no dedicated dog park in the City and that a dog park is not listed on the project list. Through the planning process, one of the concept plans includes a number of sites including a new dog park. These concept plans take into account many of the concerns raised at the meeting including gaps in service.
- Another issue was more clarity about the “meets multiple plan objectives” criterion. This criterion sought to identify the number of plan objectives which a given project meets by advancing the goals of previous planning efforts, support in regional planning objectives and or supporting the PROSNR vision..
- Funding is not addressed in the criteria for scoring projects (at this time) but is an influence of the order of how a project can be implemented. If there was available land for a new park, the scoring could be increased.

Renton Parks, Recreation, Open Space and Natural Resources Plan

- A participant asked about public input that wasn't a key finding. Feedback from the workshop was screened to identify major themes conveyed during public outreach opportunities and helped to identify the criteria.
- The Planning Director clarified that while the screening criteria are helpful, further analysis is needed to quantify the realities of the list. Sorting of the list can be shown by specific planning area, City wide, by park type, etc. Through this, residents can identify projects that are specific to their neighborhood. In addition, some of the more specific needs will be addressed in future specific area plans.
- Based on meeting feedback, quantity versus quality is an important consideration. Larger parks can accommodate a greater number of needs. A local park in every community may not be the best approach to Renton. There is a need for parks with multiple facilities. However, although Renton has been successful in building parks, adding too many sites may dilute the system (in terms of the ongoing maintenance and operational costs).
- A participant asked about the ranking of corridors and whether natural area characteristics and important connections are factored into the scoring. Environmental factors such as salmon habitat are an important consideration. The review of these projects is based on a broader look of projects and the criteria attempts to capture existing conditions such as natural features and connections. As an example, a participant noted a new routing of Springbrook Creek (East side of Talbot, north of the Trout Farm) which provides a good opportunity for public access to wetlands, similar to the Oak Creek trail.
- Participants asked about the change in ranking over time, based on changing conditions and new planning efforts. For example, adoption of the Benson Community Plan will re-rank the order of projects as proposed projects in this area will be meeting multiple planning objectives

Next Steps

MIG asked participants to take a closer look at the criteria and whether the tools are reflective of community needs. When asked, participants acknowledged that the draft criteria is appropriate as are the ranked Draft Preliminary Project List and the Draft Preliminary Program List. The project list will be revisited periodically as conditions change. MIG used the final few minutes of the meeting to summarize next steps in the planning process. This will include a meeting update for the Committee of the Whole (June 20th); and community meetings to review the documents and concept plans on June 28th – 29th.

Materials Provided

The following materials were provided to participants at this meeting (and are included in the summary pdf files):

- Agenda
- Sign in sheets
- PowerPoint Presentation used during the meeting

The following materials were provided either prior to or at the meeting, but are not attached to this summary due to file size:

- Draft Tools for Decision Making including: Program Evaluation Tool, Design Guidelines, Prioritization Criteria and Capital and operations Cost Model
- Draft Preliminary Project List and Draft Preliminary Program List Draft Community Priority Survey Summary (Appendices on project website)
- Visioning Workshop Summary and Workshop Appendices
- Needs Assessment dated May 2011
- Summary of the Interactive Mapping Results