From:	Carv Zwingle
To:	Council; Dan Thompson
Cc:	Parks & Rec Commission; Jessi Bon; Ryan Daly; Planning Commission; Ashley Hay; Ray Akers; aql1@cornell.edu; Ira Appelman; Matthew Goldbach; Lloyd Gilman; Elizabeth Buckley; Bob Harper; Traci Granbois; fletchsa1@gmail.com; Mike Cero; Gary Robinson; Doris Cassan; Dwight Schaeffer; Rob Dunbabin; Robin Russell; Susan Lund; Thomas Acker; Tom Acker; Gary Robinson; John Hall; Olivia Lippens; Dave Oberg; Robert Medved; Mark Coen; John; jkennedy59@me.com; Morrene Jacobson; Joy Matsuura; lsarchin@aol.com; Meg Lippert; Lou Glatz; Lori Robinson; Ryan Rahlfs; Rebecca Wilson
Subject:	Re: Parks Zone/February 8 Joint Planning Commission--Parks Commission Meeting.
Date:	Thursday, January 25, 2024 2:13:24 PM

Dan,
Thank you.
Carv

On Thursday, January 25, 2024, 02:05:56 PM PST, Dan Thompson <danielpthompson@hotmail.com> wrote:

Hello, I watched the parks commission and planning commission meetings on the new parks zone. I think the planning commission is not well suited to this issue. I and others complained about the short notice the parks commission was given to review the draft zone. **Thank you to Mayor Nice for scheduling a joint parks-planning commission meeting on Feb. 8 that should be in person. The parks commission should really be driving this debate. This is NOT a development debate. It is how to prohibit as much as possible development in our parks.**

I have tried to copy some of the citizens who have worked so hard over the last 15 years to protect and preserve our parks.

For *many* years I have told councils and city managers that parks should *always* be a win. When parks are not a "win" it gets ugly. Probably the smartest thing Jessi did after the acrimonious Aubrey Davis Park Master Plan process was to form the parks commission. The parks commission gets it: they represent the parks, and the citizens, and not the city or council.

Here are the basic issues for the joint meeting:

1. Which parks are placed into the parks zone. IMO if it has "park" in the name it needs to go into the zone or this process will look phony, and any park not included will create suspicion the council plans to develop that "park".

2. The USES allowed should be the same as today: only *park-related development or uses are allowed,* and to many extents the PROS plan reflects this. Ideally, we can move YFS to a new city hall, or allow a conditional use permit for *existing* non-park related uses. We do it all the time. Instead the city is trying to tailor the regulatory limits and uses in the zone to accommodate a few non-conforming conditional uses.

3. The regulatory limits must reflect the surrounding zone unless they are less in the new parks zone. Nearly every park sits in the residential zone. The mistake Ryan and the city make is requesting greater a regulatory limit for height (35') when the height limit is 30' under the RDS, and not understanding there are regulatory limits for GFAR, yard setbacks, impervious surface limits, and so on for any zone.

4. NO NEW NET IMPERVIOUS SURFACE LIMITS. This has been a central tenant at the parks commission and is the most important factor that serves as a safeguard for all the other factors, as even the CPD recognizes. The problem is the planning doesn't understand this, the decades long history of this concept, and how central this issue was to the PROS plan that the planning commission members never participated in.

5. THERE MUST BE A HEIGHTENED STANDARD FOR THE COUNCIL TO CHANGE THE USE OR ZONING OF ANY PARK IN THE ZONE. The whole motivation of a parks zone is due to past councils trying to change the zoning or use of our parks (including this council). If we create a parks zone but allow this or a future council to rezone our parks simply based on a majority vote we haven't protected any park by this zone. It will be a Trojan Horse. This is why some citizens wanted a municipal trust for our parks. My suggestion is a VOTE OF THE CITIZENS is required before the use or zoning of a park in the zone is changed.

If I could only get numbers 4 and 5 it would be a great start This parks zone was promised to be in good faith and legitimate during the campaign to renew the parks levy and increase it, and the city and council need to be honest and act in good faith during this process.

Let the parks commission lead.

Thank you.

Daniel Thompson

Thompson & Delay
Attorneys at Law
80th Avenue Professional Building
2955 80th Ave SE, Suite 202
Mercer Island, WA 98040
Phone: (206) 622-0670
Fax: (206) 622-3965