

# Question and Comment Matrix

## Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

#	Name	Section	Question/Comment	Staff Response
1	Peter Struck	Parking	<p>[Question] First, only 4 Open Space parcels* qualify for parking based on the proposed minimum size requirement of 15 acres, and then 3 of the 4 parcels would only qualify for 1 or 2 spaces. According to the staff memo, 3 of the parcels have current right of way parking that well exceeds that number (note: no info on Upper LB).</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Q#1 - Is City staff aware of parking congestion or problems reported on a consistent basis at any of the 4 parcels?</li> <li>• Q#2 - Do any of the current OSCT governance documents permit parking within park boundaries (excluding right of way), and if so, what is permitted?</li> <li>• Q#3 - Does the PROS Plan provide any guidance?</li> <li>• The 4 parcels are: Pioneer Park (114 acres), SE 53rd OS (24), Mercerdale Hillside (18) and Upper Luther Burbank (18)</li> </ul>	<p>Q#1: Staff has not observed issues with inadequate parking at Pioneer Park, SE 53<sup>rd</sup> OS or Mercerdale Hillside. Currently, there's an area used for parking at the north end of Upper Luther Burbank Park along 84<sup>th</sup> – space for approx. 4 cars. However, this area is not often at capacity, since visitors to the open space tend to park on the west side of 84<sup>th</sup> in the ROW, in order to enter the park through the central trail.</p> <p>Q#2: Parking is referenced in the Pioneer Park Master Plan and the PP Forest Management Plan. It is not referenced in OSCT bylaws or ordinances which established the Trust. The Master Plan gives recommendations for future parking changes, emphasizing the desire to minimize the visual impact of parking and avoid the concentration of parking into formal parking areas. In general, consensus was to look at slightly expanding/better organizing existing gravel parking areas in the Right of Way with a focus on ADA parking spaces along 84<sup>th</sup> Ave SE. There is no mention of parking within the park boundaries.</p>

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

				<p>Q#3: The PROS Plan notes that parking on the shoulder of roads could become a hindrance and suggests in the Future Workplan Items section exploring options for more formalized parking at trailheads for safety and to minimize environmental impacts of encroachment toward the park space.</p>
2	Tom Hildebrandt	Parking	<p>[Comment] Given that there is adequate parking in adjacent rights-of-way, my position is that parking should be generally excluded from Open Space lands. Existing minor encroachments should be countenanced where necessary, but an effort should be made to prevent further encroachments and eventually reclaim the full extent of the open spaces. Priority should be given to areas where environmental damage is evident or likely.</p>	N/A
3	Tom Hildebrandt	Parking	<p>[Comment] The survey of existing parking near open spaces shows that there is generally sufficient parking within the adjacent right-of-way. The recommended restrictions on parking within Open Space (Section D) would still allow up to a dozen parking spaces within Pioneer Park. I think this runs counter to the intent of Open Space as "largely undeveloped lands". My vote would be to disallow parking entirely. However, this would be with the understanding that parking -- even including paved parking areas -- would be allowed within adjacent rights-of-way.</p>	N/A

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

4	Ashley Hay	Parking	<p>[Question] If we specify a certain number of parking spots, as is currently drafted, what becomes of the currently available parking? Would that still exist, so that we essentially have a blend of "formal" and "informal" parking? (I'm sure there's a better term for that but it's not coming to mind at the moment ... approved vs. unapproved parking?) I'm sure you catch my drift. In other words, are we trading the current situation for a more formalized (and also far more limited) parking scenario?</p>	<p>If currently available parking does not comply with adopted regulations, it will become legal non-conforming. There are no plans to remove existing parking options. There are no plans to implement formal parking areas immediately upon approval of the zoning code. Even if parking is included as a permitted use, staff would still undergo a planning process to design and implement parking as needed based on the provisions of the code, and would need to evaluate options at that juncture.</p>
5	Ashley Hay	Parking	<p>[Question] MICC 19.05.XXX – Open space zone development standards. [New Section], D. 2. reads: "2. Design. Parking lot design must be approved by the city engineer." The term "<b>parking lot</b>" does not seem appropriate for the very limited parking being proposed. Can we remove "lot" from this document?</p>	<p>"Parking area" may be a more fitting description. Staff support making this revision.</p>
6	Ashley Hay	Parking	<p>[Question] There seems to be consensus that the community is very opposed to paving open spaces ... if Parking does become an approved use in this Open Space Zone, can and should we specify what type of parking it will be? Paved/lined parking spaces vs. gravel parking vs. other options? Just a thought. This may or may not be appropriate in the development standards, maybe this is more of a procedural issue.</p>	<p>Parking area conditions for each open space would need to be evaluated on a case-by-case basis similar to trails. City staff agrees that pavement is not the first choice of surface for parking – the preference is to use materials that have the least impact on open spaces. However, ADA standards indicate that parking spots and adjacent accessible areas be firm, stable and slip resistant, which may require paved surfaces.</p>

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

7	Ashley Hay	Restrooms	<p>[Question] Comment regarding restroom - a question came up in the previous meeting regarding size ... the draft states not to exceed 200 sq ft and 17 feet high (the measurements of current Deane's restroom) - is this reasonable given current building standards? i.e. If most restrooms of this nature are typically 18 feet high these days (or 16 or 14), I would hate to box ourselves into that height of 17 feet.</p>	<p>It's a good question about whether or not this is a reasonable standard. If a restroom was procured for Pioneer Park, we could have it custom built to meet these specifications. If the PRC/OSCT support this recommendation, we'd suggest removing the height limit and keeping the 200 square foot size limit.</p>
8	Don Cohen	Signs and Kiosks	<p>[Comment] Open Space Development Standards, Section E-1— SIGNS. I'm not convinced yet that MICC 19.12.080 would work adequately with Open Spaces. I see a few references to parks and recreation facilities, etc. in that current Code section, but it is primarily related to developed areas and/or buildings. I keep thinking that open space land is fundamentally different from other city property and that, despite staff's desire to have a "one size fits all" sign standard, that may not be the best way to go to protect these very sensitive areas.</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a) For example, exterior lighting on signs is permissible under the current Code. Personally, I do not think exterior lighting should be permissible in the Open Space Zone for a variety of reasons we've discussed previously.</li> <li>b) Under the current Code, I do see that directional signs are limited to 3 square feet in size, but other freestanding ground signs can be 25 square feet. What kinds of large signs in open spaces might this authorize?</li> </ul>	<p>The strong preference of the City's Community Development Director is for all sign related regulations to be in one portion of the code. The idea of deferring to the City-wide sign code is not to allow all potentially available signs in open spaces, but as a way to ensure sign regulations City-wide are addressed and implemented on a holistic and consistent basis.</p> <p>City Staff are not anticipating placing exterior illuminated signs within open space areas, even if technically allowable.</p> <p>See next section for staff follow-up on a proposed code revision.</p>

# Question and Comment Matrix

## Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

			<p>c) I also see that directional signs under the current Code are to be limited in number to, among other things, avoid a cluttered appearance, but again, what about other signs in open spaces?</p> <p>d) Maybe I'm missing it, but I don't offhand see in the current Code anything that would require low impact colors, materials, and style, other than with respect to a building or complex. The Open Space Conservancy Trust has these kinds of standards, as I recall.</p>	
9	Don Cohen	Signs and Kiosks	<p>[Comment] Revise Open Space Zone Development Standard E-1 on page 3 to read:</p> <p>1. Signs shall be governed by MICC 19.12.080, except as follows:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>a. No sign shall be larger than three square feet, other than at an entrance to Open Space Lands, where a sign shall not be larger than _____ square feet. [Question on maximum size at entrances: twenty-five square feet? Whatever the size of a standard entrance sign is—e.g., at Pioneer Park].</li> <li>b. Exterior lighted signs are prohibited.</li> <li>c. Natural colors and materials shall be required unless public health or safety, or maintenance or durability considerations, clearly demand otherwise.</li> <li>d. Signs of any type shall be used sparingly to avoid a cluttered appearance and not detract from the purposes and experience of the Open Space Zone.</li> </ul>	City staff is working on a proposed code revision for consideration by the PRC/OSCT that is similar to what Commission Cohen is proposing.

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

10	Tom Hildebrandt	Signs and Kiosks	[Comment] In MICC 19.06.020.A.1, note that signs may not be placed on public property except within public rights-of-way. Ownership by the City would prohibit individuals posting signs within Open Space lands.	Correct. Current code already prohibits individuals posting signs within open space lands.
11	Don Cohen	Trail Standards	[Comment] Open Space Development Standards, Section F – TRAIL STANDARDS. I would like to have additional discussion of why only trail width should be regulated in the Open Space Zone. I did hear staff’s rationale for that, but I guess I still think some limitations on general types of materials, colors, etc. should be considered further.	<p>Construction and design decisions are based on unique field conditions at each property. We attempted to draft some additional code language to further inform trail standards, but quickly failed. There is considerable variation in how trails are built in open space areas, as was noted in the prior presentation. The City Code does not allow for variances to the zoning code, so we are locked into what is included here.</p> <p>If trail standards are a high priority, the PRC/OSCT should make sure that is called out in the hand-off memo as a high priority work item for the City Council to consider.</p>
12	Tom Hildebrandt	Trail Standards	[Comment] Attendees should have received a copy of the Pioneer Park Final Master Plan (2001), in which trail standards are discussed in some detail. I would recommend using this as the basis for a separate "Trail Construction and Maintenance Guidelines" to be developed by the P&R department and approved by the PRC and OSCT. The existing guidelines could be used for now, and review/revision/approval of this document scheduled for a future set of meetings.	The City will soon be undertaking a process to update the Pedestrian and Bicycle Facilities Plan. We will consider developing comprehensive trail standards as part of that plan. Individual park master plans provide another opportunity to develop site specific trail standards.

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

13	Tom Hildebrandt	Trail Standards	[Comment] I recommend referring to an external "Trail Guidelines" document, using the specifications from the 2001 Pioneer Park Master Plan as a basis. The guidelines should give the P&R Department considerable leeway in the actual construction methods and materials used.	See previous staff comment.
14	General Question from last PRC/OSCT Meeting	Public Art (Info)	What art pieces are currently located in open space areas?	<p>Currently one piece of the <a href="#">City's Public Art Collection</a> (Mythical Bird) is sited within an Open Space property (Pioneer Park). An additional piece (Flocks) is located below Gallagher Hill Open Space within the Right of Way/Aubrey Davis Park.</p> <p>Other installations or features with artistic elements include (and are not included in the Public Art Collection) are:</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• Peace Pole (Pioneer Park)</li> </ul> <p>Various benches or features with adornments or artistic features memorial plaques (small bird figure in Pioneer) are also included throughout the open space system, but not well inventoried.</p>
15	Don Cohen	Public Art	Open Space Zone, Section C-7—PUBLIC ART. I would like to have more discussion on the 18th about whether Public Art should be permitted in Open Spaces at all. The vote was a close split the last time, but several participants on the 18th were not able to attend on the 4th and may have some views. Personally, I remain in favor of not permitting public art in the Open Space zone. If it is included, I would suggest	Limited public art could be a possibility as we have used "limited" to describe the public parking in the permitted use section. Staff support the addition of this term.

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

			some limiting term with the reference to public art. I know that when someone keeps reading, they will see the limitations, but, given that there are limitations in Section C stated for public parking, Temporary uses, wireless facilities, and utilities, I think something should be added to avoid confusion—perhaps inserting “limited” before “Public Art” or alternatively have it read “Public Art (with limitations)” or words to that effect.	
16	Don Cohen	Public Art	[Comment] Open Space Zone Development Standards, Section G-1—PUBLIC ART See above comment on whether public art should be a permitted use at all. If it is, for clarity and consistent with the hand-off memo, insert “per property” at the end.	
17	Tom Hildebrandt	Public Art	[Comment] Permitted uses of Open Space do not necessarily need to reflect the status quo. Rather, they should reflect the ultimate goal. If the consensus is to prohibit public art within the OS zone, existing public art installations such as the Mythical Bird and Peace Pole could still be grandfathered in as nonconforming uses. In any case, I would not advocate for their removal.	Confirming that existing public art will become non-conforming if art is not allowed in open spaces.
18	Tom Hildebrandt	Public Art	[Comment] I also consider art installations to be contrary to the goal of having Open Space be "largely undeveloped". My vote would still be to disallow such installations entirely.  It should be noted that MICC 19.06.060 allows encroachments into the public right-of-way subject to an Encroachment Agreement. The City can certainly agree to allow public art as an encroachment in the adjacent right-of-way. That would answer the purpose of allowing public	Confirming that existing public art will become non-conforming if art is not allowed in open spaces.



# Question and Comment Matrix

## Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

			<p>art at open spaces without compromising the habitat within the Open Space proper.</p> <p>Existing non-conforming art installations should be grandfathered in.</p>	
19	Paul Burstein	Public Art	<p>[Question] “Public Art is proposed to be permitted on Open Space Land larger than 15 acres with a limit of one art piece per property.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"> <li>• There are currently 3 pieces that I’m aware of within Pioneer Park, northwest quadrant. There is a Rotary Peace obelisk, the mythical bird, and a small bird on the top rail of a bench. In this proposal would two be declared nonconforming, or would two need to be removed?</li> <li>• Secondly, are the three quadrants of Pioneer Park considered as one Open Space Land or each their own entity for purposes of such limits? For example, NW quadrant, NE quadrant, and SE quadrant? This is also relevant to the Zone Establishment, Section E: “A zone map may be divided into parts and each part may, for purposes of identification, be subdivided into units. Such parts may be separately and successively adopted by means of an amendment of this Code and, as adopted, such zone map, or its parts, shall become a part of this Code.”</li> <li>• Rather than limiting to one piece, it should conform to the existing MICC 3.55.020 for the Arts Council and approved by the City Council.</li> </ul>	<p>Confirming that existing public art will become non-conforming if art is not allowed in open spaces.</p> <p>Pioneer Park is considered one property.</p>

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

20	Paul Burstein	Public Art	<p>[Comment] “Public art must be culturally or historically relevant to the Open Space Land”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• This should be amended to include “celebrating the nature with the Open Space Land”.</li></ul>	City staff are open to suggestions about how to describe what public art is appropriate in open spaces.
21	Paul Burstein	Public Art	<p>[Question] “Natural colors and materials shall be required.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Same as in Section 1 above, if accepted, would one of the existing pieces be considered nonconforming? The bird, as an example is not a natural color or material.</li><li>• There may be pieces considered art that are not necessarily a natural color or material. A decorative metal bike rack is a possible example.</li></ul>	Confirming that existing public art will become non-conforming if art is not allowed in open spaces.
22	Paul Burstein	Definitions	<p>[Question] “Passive Recreational Uses. Passive recreational uses have a low impact on the facilities used, and include activities such as hiking, wildlife viewing, walking, jogging, or picnicking. Passive recreational uses place minimal stress on a site’s resources; as a result, passive recreational uses are highly compatible with natural resource protection,” in conjunction with the definition of a trail: “An off-street path for passive recreational uses.”</p> <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>• Is this list meant to be all inclusive? We did discuss this at the last joint meeting and should be clarified again. In this case, does this mean anything with wheels except for ADA purposes would be forbidden within the zone? Like bicycles, tricycles, etc? Noted in Hand Off Memo encouraging the City Council to update code and park policies. We also discussed horse riding on the designated trail in the NW quadrant and throughout the SE quadrant.</li></ul>	The list is not meant to be all inclusive. The examples listed provide a general description of activities that are permissible. Bicycles were not included in the list because not all open spaces would allow bicycles. Rules of individual open spaces may specify additional allowed uses.

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

23	Ashley Hay	Public Art	<p>[Comment] Similar comment regarding art - the measurements for art (nothing bigger than the bird statue) are very limiting. If we're allowing art, it seems that there should be some flexibility. Same comment regarding it MUST be culturally or historically relevant. Blending in with the natural environment seems reasonable, but not exceeding the size of the bird and requiring cultural or historical relevancy is extremely prescriptive. Thinking of the display of birds near Gallagher open space ... this is a very tasteful natural display and each bird is small, but collectively, the art takes up a fairly large area. With the drafted guidelines, would something like this be prohibited? And would natural pieces of art (something depicting a sun or mountains or water, etc.) be prohibited because it lacks historical or cultural relevance?</p>	<p>City staff are open to suggestions on how to regulate public art pieces. Staff attempted to draft the code to limit size and type of public art as a middle ground between those who do and do not support public art in open spaces.</p>
24	Tom Hildebrandt	Zone Establishment	<p>[Comment] G.2. I commented earlier that the newly established OS zone should be a catch-all if no other zone designation applies. As such, it should be added to the end of the list, "... C-O, TC, B, and OS."</p>	<p>There are no areas on the island that do not have a zoning designation.</p>
25	Don Cohen	Memo	<p>[Comment] Page 2, 3rd full paragraph regarding "other park properties" – I would suggest revising the second sentence to read something like this: "Some felt those areas should be addressed now, but staff provided input and recommendations regarding the challenge of delineating the open space area from the rest of the park under the timeline in which is work is being developed, so those open space areas are not included in the new Open Space Zone at this point."</p>	<p>Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.</p>

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

26	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 3, first line –Consider revising the word “structures” as confusing to the reader with respect to trails. Maybe use something like “structures and other amenities and furnishings such as ...”	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.
27	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 4, in the paragraph right before Development Standards, consider starting a new paragraph with the two sentences about Utilities so it isn’t lost within the wireless material.	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.
28	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 4, In the 3rd paragraph under Development Standards, 4th line, after the word “furnishings”, consider adding some words, maybe in a parenthetical, giving a few examples of what “furnishings” refers to.	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.
29	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 5, first full paragraph. See comments above re signs.	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.
30	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 5, 2nd full paragraph. See comments above re trails. If trails remain regulated only as to width, consider inserting at the beginning of the second sentence something like “Based on staff input and recommendation, ...”	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.
31	Don Cohen	Memo	[Comment] Page 5, 3rd full paragraph—See comments above re Public Art. Depending on the discussion on April 18, consider inserting a comment on the difference of opinion on this issue. <ul style="list-style-type: none"><li>a. In the first line of the 3rd full paragraph, after “15 acres”, consider inserting “(presently Pioneer Park, Upper Luther Burbank, Mercedale Hillside, and SE 53rd Place Open Space)” to provide context.</li></ul>	Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.

## Question and Comment Matrix

### Draft Open Space Zone

April 18, 2024

32	Tom Hildebrandt	Memo	<p>[Comment] In the hand-off memo, I'd like to include the recommendation that certain disused rights-of-way be converted into open-space proper, consistent with the goals of setting aside open space for environmental preservation and public enjoyment. In reviewing the King County parcel maps, I noticed that Ellis Pond is transected by two intersecting public rights-of-way. Converting those ways into proper Open Space would disallow parking and posting signage (e.g.) within that environmentally sensitive area.</p> <p>I would recommend that City staff develop a list of the lands to be converted including legal descriptions, so that the alterations can be recorded with the County Clerk.</p>	<p>Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.</p> <p>Just a footnote to indicate that not all ROW can or should be converted to open space. Many ROW designations are in place due to underground utilities or for other reasons.</p>
33	Tom Hildebrandt	Memo	<p>Additional Recommendations: Evaluate disused public rights-of-way within or adjacent to the inventoried Open Spaces, and consider including them within the newly-created Open Space zone.</p>	<p>Suggestion will be included as part of discussion with PRC/OSCT.</p>