CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

Planning Commission
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
Thursday, February 9, 2017

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 13, 2016
PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items
GROW COMMUNITY PHASE 2 SITE PLAN & DESIGN REVIEW MAJOR AMENDMENT/FINAL SUBDIVISION ALTERATION - Recommendation
REVIEW OF MAJOR SITE PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW PROJECTS - Discussion
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
Chair Mack Pearl called the meeting to order at 6:34 PM. Commissioners in attendance were Michael Lewars, Maradel Gale, Jon Quitslund, William Chester and Michael Killion. Lisa Macchio was absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Director Gary Christensen, Planning Manager Josh Machen, Senior Planner Heather Wright and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. There were not any conflicts

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES – October 13, 2016
Commissioner Quitslund asked that the quoted term "undesirable" be removed and replaced with the words "poorly planned."

> **Motion: I move they be approved as amended.**
> **Gale/Killion: Passed Unanimously 5-0**

PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items
None.

GROW COMMUNITY PHASE 2 SITE PLAN & DESIGN REVIEW MAJOR AMENDMENT/FINAL SUBDIVISION ALTERATION - Recommendation
Planning Manager Joshua Machen gave an overview of the proposed changes to the site plan of the Grow Community which included open spaces and garden plots. He highlighted the change from mixed use commercial to additional housing. Mr. Machen referenced amendments that had changed certain aspects of the community center and presented the changes in the open space for the subdivision. Commissioner Gale asked which buildings on the site plan had already been constructed. Mr. Greg Lotakis clarified which buildings had been built, which were under construction and which were not. Mr. Machen went on to describe four single family homes poised to the east and west of Building Q (the building in question) stating all four homes shared a common bottom floor parking garage together while providing a private garage within the

community garage for each single-family home. Commissioner Lewars asked if the condos were going to be sold or rented. Mr. Lotakis stated that at this time they were planned as rental units but were designed with possible future sale in mind. Mr. Lotakis also introduced project architect Glen Hartman and managing investor John Ellis. He went on to describe the differences between the originally proposed and approved mixed-use building and the current proposed multi-family building. Discussion continued with buffer width. Chair Pearl asked why a sidewalk would be allowed within a buffer. Mr. Machen stated the City's code allowed it. Commissioner Quitslund felt the applicant was transforming Shepard Way. Commissioner Killion asked what the City hoped to accomplish by participating in the HDDP program. Senior Planner Heather Wright stated there were basically three goals: 1) Innovative site design; 2) Housing unit size cap; and 3) Different housing types. Commissioner Lewars asked what was currently required in the way of affordable housing in order to achieve HDDP status. Mr. Lotakis stated 10%. Ms. Wright concurred that was the current standard. Mr. Machen reminded the Commissioners that this project was vested to previous HDDP provisions that did not require affordable housing. Commissioner Killion asked for specific water/sewer capacity information. Ms. Wright referred him to Aaron Claiborne in the City's Operations and Maintenance Division. Commissioner Gale shared her experience at the beginning of the Grow Community project detailing community meetings led by Marja Preston and the One Planet model. It bothered her that the finished product was not anything like the conceptual design presented then. Changes she mentioned had to do with parking, community gardens and the on-site school that had not materialized. Commissioner Quitslund was glad to hear there were successful integrations between Phase I and Phase II and felt if the effort was made, it would grow. Commissioner Lewars felt that although modest, this was a small step in the right direction in terms of traffic on Shepard Way and a number of much smaller units.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Stated he worked on trails and that the trail went between Grow and Madison but on a bigger scale it went all the way down Shepard, past the strawberry plant all the way to Gowen Place. He said it was important to have the feeling of being on a trail which in the past had been a public trail. He asked to see the landscape plan and asked about the trees on the plan placed within 5 feet of the asphalt, the 5-foot wide sidewalk and then 5 feet more of vegetation. He then read from page 5 of the staff report: "Consistent with the hearing examiner's condition on the plat, plantings along Shepard Way shall be in a 10-foot buffer and meet the full screen landscaping requirements. (Note: 5 feet of the buffer will be occupied by sidewalk.)" He stated that he had attended the Design Review Board (DRB) meetings and the motion made by Chair, Alan Grainger was "We've reviewed the Grow Community Phase III and we are recommending approval of revised plans submitted today, 11/21/16, with one condition: that the applicant ensure full screen requirements per hearing examiner's condition 42 are met and that Josh Machen confirms whether the 10-feet wide landscaping buffer can be met. The hearing examiner said 10 feet. The Design Review Board said 10 feet. Mr. Schmid stated it was really wrong to have it be changing things like that it, especially saying HDDP was going to justify it.

HDDP was supposed to make things better though you could call it innovative to change vegetation into concrete. It was just wrong.

Conversation ensued about the changes made to the end of the dirt trail, Shepard Way, to create a more urban setting with sidewalk, curb and gutters. Mr. Machen stated the from the edge of the curb to the building was about 12 feet up to 20 feet in certain areas. He went on to say the project still had to meet the number of tree and shrub requirements for a full screen within the space (even though the sidewalk takes up five feet of the space) which meant it would be fairly densely planted.

> **Motion: I move that we recommend what the staff has recommended and was reviewed tonight.**
> **Lewars/Chester: Passed 3-2**

REVIEW OF MAJOR SITE PLAN AND DESIGN REVIEW PROJECTS - Discussion

Planning Director Gary Christensen opened the discussion by speaking about the general trend in the Planning world to have early coordination, collaboration and consultation on projects. He stated regulations and requirements had become more complex and there was a lot more discussion occurring early on in the design review process. Mr. Christensen said City Staff had discussed the idea of doing just that by bringing certain land use proposals to the Planning Commission earlier on for their review, collaboration, consultation and so forth. He went on to say this was in particularly in regard to major site plan and design reviews as was recently discovered in the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code (BIMC). He said that not only should they be following this code, but that it also made a lot of sense. BIMC 2.16.040 D4c dealt with site plan and design reviews, more specifically major site plan review and those actions that were to come before the Planning Commission. He cited the code: "The director shall determine what the major issues are and the specific aspects of the project" and that "the director should identify those and bring them to the Planning Commission early on. Mr. Christensen said the form would not necessarily be a staff report but something in advance of the Department doing its thorough review. He described how he envisioned this process playing out was by staff identifying the major issues and some of the major aspects of the proposal and would prepare a directive memorandum with a project description, major issues and other specific project aspects that would be reviewed by the Planning Commission. There would already have been a DRB recommendation as well as criteria for the Planning Commission to consider and make recommendations to staff on. Mr. Christensen felt one of the major objectives to that kind of process was that it allowed the Planning Commission to be involved early on in the design review process. It gave them an opportunity to influence, suggest and recommend issues with regards to major projects earlier instead of feeling as though the project was complete when it came before them. So instead of feeling like they were simply rubberstamping a project, they would have the chance to make constructive comments and recommendations. Mr. Christensen told the Commissioners they just wanted to talk about this approach and gauge their interest in it.

Commissioner Quitslund asked where this approach would take place relative to the Pre-App process. Mr. Machen answered that it would still take place during the site plan design review process which was after the Pre-App. He also said it was still part of the formal process and they were still having to follow the code as part of the formal process. Mr. Machen said the Grow Community project they had just recommended was a prime example. They had spent four months making sure everything was right and in place before it was presented to the Planning Commission which may leave the Commissioners feeling as though they did not have any meaningful input. Commissioner Gale asked which activities would fall under this. Mr. Machen stated major site plan and design review which was required by any commercial or multi-family development. Chair Pearl asked if this was in addition to the normal review they were performing currently. Mr. Machen said no, it would be an earlier opportunity to provide input to the director versus at the 11th hour the stamp that goes to the director. He felt having their review earlier in the process gave them the opportunity to have more meaningful input than it did at the end. He stated it was still incumbent upon staff and the director that every project meets every aspect of the BIMC. The question was asked if the projects would come back for a second review and Mr. Machen stated they would not. The Planning Commissioners felt the projects had to come back to them again a second time. Commissioner Chester argued the earlier review should happen before the DRB made a recommendation because once the DRB review was completed, the design was set. Commissioner Lewars agreed they should review the projects earlier but added they needed to see the projects at the end as well. Commissioner Gale agreed she would not want it to be an either/or situation. Mr. Christensen mentioned that while City Council was reviewing the draft Comprehensive Plan, they were discussing the roles of the Planning Commission and the DRB and whether there should be more involvement in a wider range of project review and the results of that discussion were yet unknown. He went on to say there would be more discussion on this in the future. Commissioner Quitslund offered the idea of a retreat with the Planning Commissioners and Staff to sort out their priorities and work plan.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:47 PM.

Approved by:

J. Mack Pearl

J. Mack Pearl, Chair

JRasely

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
February 9, 2017

PLEASE PRINT

Name	Address	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No	Would like to speak	Subject
GREG LOTAKIS	6466 NE [illegible] RD BI	greg.lotakis@gmail.com	NO		

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
February 9, 2017

PLEASE PRINT

Name	Address	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No	Would like to speak	Subject
John Ellis	3628 Point White	ellis@pacrimfix.com		No	Grow
CHARLES Schmid	ABC 265 Erickson	ceschmid@att.net		YES	