

# imagine KUTZKY

\* Building on the past \* Planning for the future \*

## **Citizens Council Meeting Minutes**

6/15/05

Present: Dave Edmonson, Chris Flood, Kris Hebring, Scott Hebring, Sister Mary Eliot Crowley, Kellie Threinen, Marcia Marcoux; staff, Andy Masterpole, Stephanie Kilen, Sean Allen

Not Present: Dan Ellenbaum, Jennifer Mulvihill

### **Approval of minutes:**

Approval of minutes from 5/18/05 Citizens Council meeting was added to the agenda; minutes approved unanimously.

### **Set next meeting date:**

Next meeting date scheduled for July 13<sup>th</sup>. Stephanie will check with Jennifer and Dan to see if they can attend. If Jennifer can attend, meeting will be held at 7:30 p.m. If not, meeting will be held at 7:00 p.m. Stephanie will confirm with group.

### **United Way Presentation:**

Andy and Stephanie summarized their meeting with United Way Executive Committee on 6/7/05 to discuss potential improvement to UW property. Specific focus was on playground and decreasing parking lots in favor of additional green space. The general feel of the UW meeting was not overall positive. While they recommended we continue to work with the Properties Committee to craft a proposal and bring it back to the Executive Committee, there were opinions expressed that the UW is already doing something for the neighborhood and maybe they should attend a neighborhood meeting to educate the neighborhood better on the positive things they are doing.

Dave had located a copy of the minutes from the school board meeting during which the decision was made to sell the school building to the UW for \$1. An agreement stated that for 7 years the school district would have free use of the building for certain services they needed to provide out of that location. No restrictions remained on the property after that time.

Discussion among the Citizens Council focused of dissatisfaction of the United Way's attitude toward the neighborhood and reception of the Imagine Kutzky presentation. It was discussed that the strategy should be that we pursue making a proposal with the Properties Committee who will then bring it to the Executive Committee. It was agreed that if they refuse to upgrade their playground, which the Parks Dept. is willing to provide at no expense to the UW, a response to that should be developed.

Andy and Stephanie have an upcoming meeting with the Parks Dept. regarding the UW playground upgrade possibilities, and will report back to the group after that meeting.

### **Dog Park, Info from Parks Dept:**

Stephanie reported that she had spoken with Denny Stotz from the Parks Dept. to follow up on the possibility of discussing a dog park in Kutzky Park. He said that somebody from the neighborhood had already been in to propose the idea. Denny circulated it among the staff, and the unanimous feedback was that it wasn't an appropriate use for that area. The limited amount of undeveloped green space in the park,

combined with projected heavy traffic generated by such a popular use would be inappropriate. They also didn't feel the location was a big enough area to put a dog park there. Denny also mentioned that a more appropriate space might be the new Cascade Lake, which will be accessible from Kutzky once developed, although no plans exist for that as of yet.

Discussion among the Citizens Council surrounded disappointment that we the neighborhood leadership had not been made aware of the process, and that the topic seemed to be removed from discussion so quickly by the Parks Dept. The group voted that we should pursue the idea anyway, and change the approach a bit. Marcia recommended starting over as opposed to begging the question about why they changed their minds when they seemed supportive a few months ago. She also mentioned that a fear might be creating a new use in Kutzky, and wondering what they would tell other neighborhoods who came forward to ask for park amenities. Sean recommended not being insistent about the exact location at first, but pushing the question of where else can an amenity like this be placed in our area so we aren't always pushing popular uses to the fringes of the city. Andy mentioned skepticism over a location at Cascade Lake due to the extreme challenge of connecting that park to Kutzky by path, as well as the fact that it's 5 to 10 years from development. He mentioned Cook Park as another possible location due to good access off the bike path from Kutzky. Marcia offered her assistance to work with the Parks Dept. to find out what all the concerns are and what solutions might be.

The group voted unanimously to pursue the establishment of a dog park in the Kutzky Park area. Stephanie and Andy will discuss the issue again with Denny when they meet with him regarding the United Way playground.

### **Land Use Plan Amendment:**

Andy explained the land use plan proposed by Jeff Ellerbush at Planning and Zoning. He also presented a land use plan he sketched up with some vague ideas to show the difference in the type of zoning approach he would like to see us take, vs. that of what the Planning and Zoning Department has in mind.

The group expressed disappointment in the proposed plan from Planning Dept. staff. Dave pointed out that the plan is only a reflection of what the current zoning is because the P & Z dept. never updated it after the neighborhood was rezoned several years ago. On the proposed land-use plan from the P & Z Dept., no work had been done to show what the future use of land in the neighborhood should be.

A lengthy discussion ensued about the how the land-use plan should be developed when creating a Special District. Terminology on the land-use plan will need to reflect what the special district will be, and certain districts will need to be indicated on the land-use plan, as opposed to 'zones' currently referred to with conventional zoning.

The discussion eventually guided the group toward the general idea that the land-use cannot be developed separately from the Special District. Without having the details developed, nobody really knows what we would be referring to on the land-use plan, which is supposed to be more general. By removing 'zones' and beginning to plan for more mixed-use districts, we have to know more specifically what each of those districts is to be like before we can make assumptions about the land-use plan.

The group expressed concern for the potential that P & Z might be rushing the land-use plan through without giving proper consideration to it. Andy explained that we do not have to rush the approval process, and can certainly put it off until the Special District and Design Guidelines are developed, which is in the work plan for completion in October.

With the general consensus that the Special District needed to be developed before a land-use plan could be approved, further discussion on this issue should resume at the July Citizens Council meeting.

### **Two-Way Traffic, Approval Process;**

Marcia researched the approval process for converting the streets to two-way traffic with City Administration. She learned that only the City Council can convert a one-way street to two-way. It is not an issue that is to be public hearing, but is rather to be established by resolution.

Stephanie asked if the group was comfortable that we had done enough to inform the neighborhood about the issue, or if they felt we needed to try and petition for a public hearing. Dave expressed that we

have talked about this on several occasions with the neighborhood and it was time to have the council approve it. Kris also emphasized that this is a trial on one street, and if it really doesn't work, it will revert back. Marcia said she would discuss the timeline for getting this on the city council agenda as soon as David Kramer, Traffic Engineer, returned from vacation.

A motion was made that the Citizens Council recommend the two-way traffic trial on 1<sup>st</sup> Street SW be brought to the City Council in the form of a resolution as soon as possible for approval. The motion passed unanimously.

**Formalizing Procedures and Policies  
PR, Fundraising and Outreach**

Due to the length of discussion on other issues and late hour, these items were tabled until the next meeting.

Meeting adjourned at 9:50 p.m.