

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 12, 2017 and February 9, 2017
PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items
NICKUM OPEN SPACE TAX CLASSIFICATION – Public Hearing
CARLSON OPEN SPACE TAX CLASSIFICATION – Public Hearing
BAINBRIDGE LANDING – Site Plan and Design Review/Subdivision
MADRONA SCHOOL – Site Plan and Design Review/Conditional Use Permit
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure

Chair J. Mack Pearl called the meeting to order at 6:00 PM. Planning Commissioners in attendance were Michael Lewars, Maradel Gale, Jon Quitslund, William Chester and Lisa Macchio. Michael Killion was absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Director Gary Christensen, Planning Manager Josh Machen, Senior Planners Jennifer Sutton and Heather Wright and Administrative Specialist Lara Lant who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. There were no conflicts disclosed.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - January 21, 2016

Motion: I move to approve the minutes as distributed of January 12th and February 9th, 2017.

Gale/Quitslund: Passed Unanimously 6-0.

PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items

None.

NICKUM OPEN SPACE TAX CLASSIFICATION – Public Hearing

Senior Planner Jennifer Sutton began the Open Space Classification Public Hearing with a description of the Nickum's property and a statement about the process. The Nickums own a 5.88 acre parcel and have applied to reclassify 4.15 acres of it to Open Space Land. A good portion of the property is taken up by Springbrook Creek and associated wetlands. Springbrook Creek is a fish bearing stream. This property is a good candidate for Open Space Land classification as it is adjacent to other properties already designated as Open Space Land. It would contribute to a larger, ecosystem protected corridor surrounding Springbrook Creek. The Planning Commission is a recommending body to both the City Council and the County Commissioners who will make a decision on this project at a separate meeting. Commissioner Quitslund asked if the city had an Open Space Plan that mapped these spaces and looked at perspective candidates for future Open Space classification. Planner Sutton said the city doesn't

look at perspective candidates under the tax program and perhaps that could be a feature of the city's outreach in the future. Commissioner Quitslund stated he would like more progress with Land Trust planning. Chair Pearl asked if this was a permanent classification? Planner Sutton said it was permanent unless the property owner removed it from the classification and paid the tax penalty. Commissioner Macchio said the property fit the criteria that was provided in State law and thanked both the Nickums and the Carlsons for putting their properties into Open Space designations.

Mr Nickum said they wished they had done this sooner. They had known about the process for years but only now got around to applying for the Open Space Classification. Commissioner Quitslund said there was a discrepancy in the record which mentioned one house but there were really two - a house and an additional dwelling unit.

Motion: I move we recommend approval of the Open Space Application for the Nickum Open Space property, PLN50744OS.
Gale/Lewars: Passed Unanimously.

CARLSON OPEN SPACE TAX CLASSIFICATION – Public Hearing

Jennifer Sutton introduced the Carlson properties as three properties located south of Arrow Point Drive, adjacent to the Forest to Sky Trail. The northern property was undeveloped, the southern two were classified as Timberland Open Space and all three will be reclassified as Open Space. Mr Carlson entered into an agreement with the Park District and the Land Trust and a public trail had been constructed which connected the Grand Forest to Battle Point Park. Commissioner Quitslund said title to the land was retained by the Carlson but Land Trust easement governs the uses of it. Planner Sutton agreed this was true.

Commissioner Pearl asked for public comment. There was none. Commissioner Pearl asked if city staff recommended this reclassification and Planner Sutton said yes.

Commissioner Lewars asked what the point of the reclassification was, since taxes decreased on one property but increased on the two others. Mr Carlson said he couldn't leave the property classified as Timberland Open Space because he eliminated harvesting with a conservation easement. Though taxes will increase, he's reclassifying the property because Kitsap County indicated they would fine him for having property in the Timberland Open Space classification that wasn't harvestable. Commissioner Quitslund asked Mr Carlson if development rights were transferrable or extinguished and Mr Carlson replied they were extinguished. Mr Carlson said historically there were fish up to Arrow Point until an improper culvert was placed on Arrow Point Drive. Anything the city could do to remedy this situation they would appreciate. Commissioner Gale wanted to know what the city could do to remedy the improper culvert.

Planner Sutton replied she noted it and would contact the Public Works Department about it. Commissioner Macchio thanked Mr Carlson.

**Motion: I move that we recommend approval of application PLN50745OS.
Lewars/Quitslund: Passed Unanimously.**

**BAINBRIDGE LANDING (PLN 50520 SPR/SUB) SITE PLAN AND DESIGN
REVIEW/SUBDIVISION - Recommendation**

Chair J. Mack Pearl stated this had been a difficult project for the Planning Commissioners to get their arms around. It was a large project and this was the first time they had formally seen it. He said it seemed they were expected to approve it without really reviewing it which was not the correct thing to do. Chair Pearl noted they were not going to make a recommendation tonight but listen to the applicant describe the project and listen to public comment. After the Planning Commissioners receive the staff report and conditions they will review it again. They will talk about it in a public hearing, listen to public comment and have a discussion themselves. And if there is a need to make the public hearing open, they will do that.

Planner Heather Wright thanked the Planning Commission Chair for expressing that concern. She said they had a major issues memo they'd like to proceed with. She requested the Planning Commission come back next Thursday, March 16th if possible to make the city's timeline for required application review. Chair Pearl said there was a one-hundred day period before the application goes before the Hearing Examiner and it would be appropriate for the Planning Commission to review the application earlier in the process. He stated it was not fair to the Planning Commissioners to have only one week to review it. They had reservations about the process but would try to review it as requested. Commissioner Lewars said the small amount of project information the Planning Commission was supplied for review, especially in a compressed time, was unlike anything he had seen before.

Planner Wright presented a slide show about Major Issues and Specific Aspects of Bainbridge Landing, as required by the municipal code. These issues and aspects were identified after review by the Planning Director, the project had been reviewed by the Design Review Board and opened to two public comment periods due to modification of the plan. It was scheduled for Hearing. The proposed project was just to the north of Harbor Square on a 4.86 acre site. It would be developed with 140 residential units comprised of 18 townhomes, 7 lofts, and a 115 unit apartment building. Part of the project scope included removal and relocation of the historic house on the property and the applicant has proposed a 1 acre park to be located east of the project site abutting Ferncliff Avenue. This park was being proposed to acquire a floor area ratio bonus. In addition to the site plan review, the applicant was proposing to subdivide the property into 27 lots to include 25 single family homes, 1 multi-family home and a 1 acre park. This was a Tier One project under the HDDP program and will be considered a LEED community. In accordance with Tier One projects, they are required to restrict home size to no greater than 1600

square feet, receive 5 points within the housing diversity category and receive a minimum of 16 points in innovative site design.

Architect Charles Wenzlau gave a slide presentation of the proposal. Olympic Property Group was the project developer, the company that originally owned and founded Port Gamble and the Pope and Talbot Company. They had deep roots in Kitsap County. The site had been in the ownership of the Cave Family since about 1890. The Harbor Square development property was also owned by the same family. In addition to required public meetings, Olympic Property Group had a series of 8 meetings held over the last year, starting before the project was designed and meeting in cycles to keep neighbors informed of what they were doing. This outreach has been successful. The developers want to realize a neighborhood that becomes part of the community. Additional public features include a community space in the northeast corner of the development which will be a significant connection point in the neighborhood. The park has been created by a Cave family member who contributed 1 acre. The historic house that sits in the park will be relocated and preserved just north of the project site. Sustainability goals are characterized as a transit-oriented development where there is opportunity to reduce vehicle usage including extensive bike facilities with bike storage in the main entry lobby. There will be both ownership and rental properties to encourage multi-generational residents. The entire project complies with LEED certification.

The site would be served by two public roads. The north access lane would be a two-way public street through the site. The access lane on the south closest to Harbor Square would be one-way, moving from Ferncliff Ave towards Cave Avenue, to the primary access to parking underneath the apartment building. Chair Pearl asked if this parking would exit onto Cave Avenue. Charles Wenzlau replied that parking associated with the apartment building would exit on the south access lane onto Cave Avenue. This design was done in coordination with the city's Public Works Department and they were following their recommendation. Charles Wenzlau stated they were required to have access on all four sides of the apartment building. The access on the south side of the apartment building was similar to Harbor Square's design. It had about 30 feet of grade drop from the high corner on Ferncliff Avenue to the low corner at Cave Avenue. The logical place to avoid big ramps was to enter as that parking garage emerged out of grade. The rest of the building was set below grade. The townhouses were set up as fee simple, for sale homes. Olympic Property Group was subdividing the property, so they could sell those as single family homes. The reason for HDDP was so they had the right to subdivide within the mixed-use town center. Pedestrian facilities, including through the park and courtyard would be open to the public. The loading area was located on the north access lane. They planned ahead for residents moving into the apartment building. The trash for the apartment building would be kept inside the parking garage until the day of pickup and then brought up to the access lane. The site was set up so garbage trucks would not be backing out. Residential parking was under the buildings. Almost 30 on-street parking space would meet guest parking needs in the neighborhood. These spaces would be public. Chair Pearl asked if they had considered ferry

commuters using those spaces and Charlie Wenzlau replied that that the City of Bainbridge Island would regulate that.

Commissioner Macchio asked what the tallest height of the building structures were and Charlie Wenzlau replied the site was unique to downtown with specific standards set up. The buildings had a wedding cake design starting at 45 feet and stairstepping down to the neighborhood to the north. Charlie Wenzlau said they went to the Design Review Board and their main discussion was focused on exterior materials. The consensus of the Design Review Board was they liked the warm natural colors. Commissioner Gale asked what else in their process needed to be refined. He said the exterior material selection needed to be finalized and they would try to use a variety of materials to break down the scale of the building to differentiate them as much as they could. Commissioner Gale asked if solar panels would be installed on the townhouses. Charles Wenzlau replied yes, the entire project would be pv ready but they wouldn't put panels on the townhouses. They hoped to put photovoltaic on the roof. Commissioner Quitslund asked about the size of the units. Charles Wenzlau replied that the larger ones were 1600 square feet, the units on Gilmore Lane were 1400 square feet and the lofts were under 1000 square feet. The materials would be stained wood, dark cedar and core ten.

Charlie Wenzlau stated Gilmore Lane had migrated over the years and was not where it was originally located. It was an encroachment onto the project. Olympic Property Group was discussing with residents the idea of abandoning the western segment. They would then fully landscape it. Commissioner Pearl asked if this was encroachment or were they claiming adverse possession. Charles Wenzlau replied it was a more a matter of would it stay or would it move. Commision Pearl said if they were claiming the road, it would change their change setbacks.

Commissioner Macchio asked what their ideas were concerning environmentally friendly features outside the building. Charles Wenzlau said covered parking made a huge difference and was big investment to help protect the environment. He also said the soils didn't infiltrated well and they would be doing water quality treatment on site then a direct discharge to salt water. There would be no on site detention tanks because they were in proximity to Eagle Harbor. Within the building, all fixtures would be low water use and would have sub meters within the buildings to monitor energy use. Commission Macchio then asked about densified small units and elements that people like when they're living so closely, such as a community pea patch. Charles Wenzlau said they looked at rooftop gardening and there was potential for a community pea patch in the park. Commissioner Macchio asked if they would take out units to put the garden in their project and not give it to the park? Charles Wenzlau said a garden was best realized on the rooftop or part of the park space. Chair Pearl asked about the structure of the land, how the 1 acre park related to the density of the buildings and the tree count. Charles Wenzlau stated that they don't regulate by density but by floor area ration (FAR) in the mixed use town centers. The code provided a public amenities bonus where you can receive up to 70 percent of your bonus FAR through a one acre park. They would receive about 80,000 square

feet less than what the maximum bonus would be through the FAR bonus provision. Commissioner Pearl asked if the park's function was just for a density bonus because it didn't take care of setbacks or open space requirements. Charles Wenzlau said the park was part of the original site and being dedicated as a park. Chair Pearl asked about the buffers around the park as he didn't see any. Charles Wenzlau replied he wasn't familiar with that rule. Chair Pearl said there was a 25 foot buffer around parkland and Charlie Wenzlau replied the 25 foot buffer came out of transition standards and right of way standards. Charles Wenzlau said they hoped the depth of the park would satisfy the screening requirement. They were preserving many of the trees in the park and the location of the park was based on the wishes of the donator of the property. The developers would be getting a financial benefit of not purchasing FARs from the city. Planner Heather Wright confirmed the park was part of the project. Chair Pearl asked if the park was part of the development then why were they giving it to the Parks to develop. Charles Wenzlau said they would give the Park District a "finished park" and the Park District could furnish it further if they chose. Chair Pearl said if they gave the park away then the development would no longer front the street. Charles Wenzlau said there were too many liability issues to maintain it as a private park. Jon Rose of Olympic Property Group stated the park would be for passive recreation. Chair Pearl asked if construction would happen on park land and Jon Rose said yes. Chair Pearl said he would like the park not touched during construction and Jon Rose said there was a lot of earth being moved for the parking garage and the park site may be used for soil storage. Jon Rose clarified the Gilmore way status: They own it but people who use it have rights of necessity, which is a permanent easement. Commissioner Lewars said this project was an opportunity to create some affordable housing. Charles Wenzlau replied that there was no requirement in the code for affordable housing, under HDDP. Jon Rose said this project would introduce more housing affordability than any other island project. Commissioner Gale asked how many parking spaces there were per apartment units and Jon Rose said there was 1 stall per unit and extra for guests. She also asked about access roads and traffic calming measures. Charles Wenzlau stated that the roads were designed to reduce traffic issues and they would be introducing speed tables to the project. Because the roads were public, they could not put No Through Access signage to prevent pass through traffic. Commissioner Gale also wanted to confirm that vehicle lights wouldn't impact neighbors at Harbor Square. Charles Wenzlau said they addressed that issue with landscape buffers and no on street parking.

Commissioner Chester asked if Gilmore Lane was in the buffer and Jon Rose replied they were working with the neighbors to shut down a portion of Gilmore Lane. Chair Pearl said they didn't really know where the property line was until this issue was resolved. Planner Heather Wright said for Cave Avenue, this project had a very specific buffer and believed the property lines were correct. Commissioner Chester stated they have a 25 foot buffer from property line and it so happens that Gilmore Lane happens to be in the buffer but that the road has never existed officially...and now it's in the buffer. Charles Wenzlau said where Gilmore Lane should be is full of mature trees. There was no motivation to push back the road. Commissioner Gale asked why they didn't use Gilmore Lane for access and Jon Rose said residents had the Right of

Necessity and still couldn't take the road. There was discussion whether to open the meeting to public comment and the decision was made to allow it.

Public Comment:

Mark Epstein, Citizen – He lives at Harbor Square and stated there were positive things about the plan but was concerned about the buffer between the Bainbridge Landing and Harbor Square. He wanted the landscape buffer to be increased as much as possible. It would be a benefit to both benefit to developments.

Dave Ward, Citizen– He lives on Cave Avenue directly across from the proposed development. He complimented Jon Rose on engaging the neighborhood on this project. He did have a concern about how the city executed the traffic study. Cave Ave is a dead end road that ends close to highway 305. Traffic is challenging and there are long delays getting in and out of Cave Avenue as the ferry is loading and offloading. The two problems with the study were they used 2014 data which didn't include the Tawresy development on Cave Avenue– those 8 units were not part of the traffic study. The second problem was the time of afternoon data collection. The afternoon collection time was from 4-6 pm which stopped 5 minutes short of the offloading 5:30 Seattle ferry and an hour short of the 6:20 offloading ferry – the 2 biggest ferry runs. It gave a false traffic picture. He hoped a 5-7 pm collection window would be used in a revised study. Finally, the 140 unit development, which he was not trying to stop, is only one of 3 developments happening on Cave Avenue. If we keep looking at traffic in tiny bites we never see it as a whole. The city has limited options dealing with a failed intersection (see attached letter referencing concurrency requirements of Growth Management Act.) Please consider the traffic study be revised.

Chair Gale asked what he hoped the outcome of the revised traffic study would be. He replied that looking at capacity of transportation was an element that should be considered in approving the size of developments. He wasn't a traffic engineer but a botanist, but thought anything that could move traffic away from the Cave Avenue intersection was a good thing.

Neil Johannsen, Citizen – He lives on Cave and Gilmore. He's a retired State Park Director. He wanted to say how good it has been working with Jon Rose and Charlie Wenzlau. They've been helpful, they've engaged us. Charlie was right that there weren't a 100 people screaming at this meeting because *they've* had meetings, even in his own living room. It seemed odd that the traffic study didn't consider the 5:30 ferry. He's actually backed cars up trying to get out of Cave Avenue because he couldn't make a left turn. He thinks the traffic study deserves more examination for a development of this size and complexity. He doesn't think the city sent out a notice about this meeting, there might be more people here if they'd receive a notice. He wanted to make a point about Gilmore. It was an old dirt, gravel road. It was not an easement, it would be perhaps a prescriptive easement. The only way to perfect that would be to go to court. They

would like to close 326 feet of the west end of Gilmore. His solution would be, instead of having 3 roads across this parcel, to close Gilmore entirely and build a trail. Take that western 326 feet and take the 15 feet OPG needs as a buffer. Not fair to call something a buffer...in front of his house it's a road. He would strongly recommend closing Gilmore, at least the western end. Because access is coming off of Ferncliff, why did they need a little dirt road? It could be revegetated and could have a trail.

Linda Mallon, Citizen – She lives on Hawley Way and has for 33 years. Her home is the first home on Hawley Way and is concerned about the urban interaction of these developments. Hawley Way is under development of new homes, home renovations, ADUs. Density is on the move there. What's happening to east side of the site, it's of concern to her. There are 2 vacant lots on Hawley Way and the owners are under press to develop their properties. We find people circle around Winslow Way to Hawley to find some traffic relief. We are offset from current fire lane at Harbor Square. Alignment is an issue. She would ask that park would have activities, how are people getting there? What activities would be sanctioned? Where are people parking? How are they getting in and out? What about Portland, they have developments with zero parking. Has this been considered? Deliveries? Moving vans? UPS etc? Urban design, how does this fit in? Help! We need we need to talk about this. We need time. Please take time to consider quality of life for existing residences as well as newly developed property to accommodate new residences.

Charles Schmid, ABC

This is one of the largest urban projects the city has seen. You have to be careful. The more decision made now make things easier in the future. The staff is so busy on things, there were no decision made but mentions that the city is "thinking" or "considering" conditions instead of stating them. These things should have been in a staff report. The issue on parks is confusing to me. You must be careful. There's nothing in here written about. Donating a park has resulted in doubling density. He would forward on more comments.

Commissioner Macchio thanked everyone who commented.

Director Christensen offered some comments about where we they were in the process. He understood the interest in the scale and scope of this project. There was a lot of community interest. It was helpful to have the applicant provide information. He respected this. He heard some good comments and Q&A and felt more knowledgeable about the project. Earlier they talked about a process in the code that a Director directive be sent to the Planning Commission. The Department has done that. He suggested we allow Planner Heather Wright time to summarize details. If there were any particular details the Commissioners wanted more information on, we would work on that for you. It was a collaborative process in formulating a recommendation. The Hearing Examiner will make the final recommendation. The Design Review Board, Planning Commission and the Planning Department will have recommendations

to be considered as well as public testimony and written comment. Ultimately, it was the Hearing Examiner's decision. He asked they allow Planner Heather Wright to speak. He didn't want them to feel rushed to judgement and they wanted to get it right.

Chair Pearl replied he wasn't prepared to comment on anything tonight except he agreed the traffic study should be amended. Director Christensen asked if there were details or questions the Planning Department hadn't identified. Commissioner Gale wanted more information on stormwater details and Design Review Board minutes. She also wanted solid conditions from the Planning Department, not tentative information. Commissioner Chester said they received a thin package of information in the mail and were asked to go online for complete details. He wanted a complete printed package. He wanted city staffs' concerns and recommendations so he could do a good job. Commissioner Gale added it was difficult to get through public comments.

Planner Wright said they spoke of most things with a few exceptions. Did the Commissioners want to ask questions of the have traffic engineers. Commissioner Quitslund said there was not enough time. Chair Pearl had questions about tree removal and other things about the project. Planner Wright requested they continue next Thursday. Chair Pearl checked with the other Commissioners before confirming they would have a quorum. Planner Wright would gather materials and forward before the next meeting.

MADRONA SCHOOL – Site Plan and Design Review/Conditional Use Permit

Planning Manager Josh Machen stated the combined application goes before the Planning Commission and ultimately to the Hearing Examiner for decision because it is a conditional use permit. The Hearing is tentatively scheduled for April 12th, 2017. Madrona School has proposed construction of a new kindergarten through 8th grade private school with a maximum of 200 students and 27 staff. The 5 acre property is on North Madison Avenue and is close proximity to Windsong Loop. The proposed project includes classrooms, a gymnasium, auditorium, and offices as well as 39 parking stalls, 5 additional drop off stalls, a playfield, stormwater facilities, and an on-site septic system. There is an existing home on the site that will remain in the initial phases of construction but may be removed later.

Missy Goss, head of Madrona School said it started in 1999 with families who wanted a Waldorf education which included a holistic curriculum and play-based learning. Madrona School has grown steadily and this year serves 145 students and rents classrooms and a greenhouse from Eagle Harbor Church. The Waldorf experience is constrained at this location and they found this 5 acre property that met the criteria for their school.

John Kennedy, Madrona School's architect, presented details of the proposal. The site was in a R-1 residential neighborhood. The school would be developed in three phases. Phase One: 1st grade through 8th grade classrooms and an administrative area with offices. Phase Two: An early childhood wing with 4 classrooms. Phase Three: A gymnasium/assembly with 3 classrooms

tucked underneath. Total square footage is 26,000 square feet. The school is generally on two floors and the footprint is 15,640 square feet, which is 7.5% of lot area. The underlying zoning allows 15% but for institutional uses, it's cut in half to 7.5 %. Their goals included retaining existing trees and buffers, good solar access for pv panels and people, keeping cars near the road, using existing features and topography, not allow offsite parking, onsite queuing for pickup and dropoff and use of the field for overflow parking. Parking was proposed for 39 cars plus 5 additional stalls for pickup and dropoff. Parents would drive up, drop off children and go fairly quickly in the am. In the pm, children would be waiting outside for pickup, which would speed up traffic flow. They wanted to limit mass to no more than 2 stories, sink the building into the ground, and break up the buildings into three different parts rather than one large one. They were considering simple construction materials such as clear low-E glass, cedar, and stained wood. Pathway lighting was downward directed and buildings had downward sconces. There would be no direct light from the site.

Commissioner Quitslund asked if the parents considered carpooling and Ms Goss replied that it was part of their parking and traffic plan and would encourage it.

Chair Pearl invited public comment.

Barbara Stuart – We have lived within 500 feet of the proposed development for over 30 years and are strongly opposed granting a conditional use permit. It's nothing against the school but it is too huge and doesn't belong in a residential neighborhood. We check the zoning carefully before moving there and didn't want to be near a school because of the congestion. What's being built is not a neighborhood school but a regional school and kids from off island are being driven in. 39 parking spaces is inadequate – they have a meeting room for 400 people. She can see parents parking and dropping students off on Windsong Loop. Fire and police access will be compromised. They shouldn't have to absorb this. She asked for two conditions: that there would be permanent No Madrona School Parking signs placed on Windsong Loop and the school cannot rent out the building for non-school use.

Bill Stuart – The bottom line is, the school is too big. No private campus enterprise can be that harmonious in a quiet neighborhood. Building plans call for 200 students, 27 instructors, and a caretaker. There are flex rooms and large classrooms and pre-kindergarten building in the plans. He can see the flex rooms becoming overflow classrooms. The auditorium built for 400 people might easily seat 600 people. We would want hard conditions, a cap on the number of people, if this goes ahead. If the school grows to 600 students, all the traffic plans would go out the window. He was unhappy he and his neighbors weren't notified before the meeting.

Pat Egaas – She lives a few hundred feet from proposed school lived at property since 1960. Nothing against Madrona program but this is over the top. She has written a letter for the record but she will summarize: The school does not blend into surrounding area. I urge you to vote no to conditional use permit. I read decision criteria, and this is a giant school campus squeezed onto

5 acres and not harmonious. Most of the building will be on the western half of the building where they live. It does not fit into the intended character of the vicinity. Per line 1A, it does not meet requirements. Compare the plan to building a retail business in the same place. Put yourself in my shoes and in the shoes of all my neighbors and imagine this coming to your neighborhood.

Lisa Foisy – Madrona is a great school and used to be a parent there. She lives in the Windsong neighborhood. She moved to neighborhood for characteristics of that place. It had low traffic and a rural feel. Very concerned about any of that being changed. She doesn't understand why there isn't another space in a differently zoned area. Her family made a huge commitment to being in that area. Things like staggered starts and carpooling, half the time parents can't due to other appointments. Where there are assumptions we need data to support. She videotaped the wait at the intersection of Hwy 305 and Sportsman Club Rd and it took 7 minutes to get through the lights during school time. She hoped that was addressed. She does everything she can do to avoid going through that intersection when school in session. Also, that's a lot of cars coming in. I have a hard time seeing how the solutions are going to work. She appreciates good intentions of the school, but like at Blakely, there's a drop off line and cars everywhere.

Ana Bucy - I have lived for 18 years on Windsong Loop and when she found out the school would be built here she broke down. This area has always been magical to her. Having possibly 200 students and 27 teachers, that's a lot of people going through that area. I don't know what time you used. The kids going to the high school will have to change their commutes. People from the north end will come in to the traffic area. She's not sure how valid the traffic statement is. Great idea but opposed to it being here. Historic Moran school would be a consideration. She's opposed to what's going on.

Steve Bucy – He lives and Windsong Loop and is proud of his daughter coming up from Spring Break to talk. He passed out comments from other neighbors. He cautioned them to pay attention of Directive memorandum. Question the numbers you see, there are some typos. He's up here not to disparage the school and has had opportunity to coach some Madrona kids in soccer. Concerned about traffic on site. If school goes forward, there may be a rezone the speed limit. Impacts if school is put forth. Excited to hear about the school's ride share program. He is suspect of plan being successful. He thinks traffic will head south not north, which is a problem. Stormwater is an issue.

Commissioner Pearl asked if traffic speed would change and Planner Machen replied it was a public safety issue and be up to the police department.

Bill Eckel – They moved here 3 years ago and did their homework – the neighborhood is all R-1 zoning. It's quiet. It's the place to retire. They were surprised and feel betrayed if the city approves the development because it's not harmonious with the neighborhood. Not disparagement of Waldorf system, just the school's location. He understands they're trying hard to accommodate

us. Education, communication, Encouragement of students and parents to control parking and traffic is what the school's goal is. So, five years, ten years from now, this institution is still here. We are still here. But maybe Missy Goss is gone and enforce this goal. They're basing their mitigation plan on people who aren't even here yet. How can you approve a conditional use permit based on the promise of people who aren't even there yet? Other issues include noise, the city has a noise ordinance. Playground noise level exceeds that ordinance. There is an exception in the city noise ordinance for screaming children but that just points out the school is not harmonious with the neighborhood. Auditorium events, no control. Traffic study needs a lot of work. Huge inconsistencies.

Reed Martic – They moved to Windsong neighborhood for same reasons as others; to find a rural quality of life. He submitted a letter. The side of traffic study we don't necessarily study - children walking up and down road, and bike traffic commuters. He would argue that though the study says this is not a problem, he believes it is and there will be unintended consequences.

Ron Peltier – He is not an immediate neighbor but lives close to the school. He read a letter from his neighbor and former classmate, Pam Quitslund-Halvorsen and Dana Halvorsen. They were we were not notified of the meeting tonight. All of the neighbors will be affected but none more than they would be. Their property borders the entire southern property line. It's been in the Halvorsen family for over 100 years. They would not be able to get away from the noise, no privacy. Nancy Lowery was a close friend of Pam for over 50 years and would be upset if she knew her property had been sold to a school, changing the neighborhood so drastically. The school would dominate the neighborhood and all next door to our property. Please consider the impact on our property and our lives. We've lived here for over 100 years and this development is just not fair and just not right.

Mr Peltier added that the traffic study showed the school would add 720 vehicle trips to the site through the day.

Deena Hanke - She lives directly across from property on Windsong loop. Lights from cars exiting the school would shine in their house. They bought the property because of the peace and quiet and hoped to live out their days there. She doesn't believe it will be possible to do that if the school is there. She doesn't believe school is compatible in residential area.

Mike Hoffman - Lives on Windsong Loop with 40 other families. Things could change in the future. It's imperative that group hands down numbers now on use, to establish limits to population, paved areas – especially population. Another boogeyman, the 80 car field parking and gymnasium could turn into a major use for the school. They want no commercial aspect of this thing. The field could turn into a mudhole and might want to pave it and then the retainage won't work. Things like that should be specified if it's going to go ahead. I don't want it to go ahead. Good site plan but may be months and years before they finish construction.

Rebecca Rockefeller – She is a lifelong resident and moved here for rural quality of life. Her daughter is a Madrona student because public schools didn't work for her. She has seen so much change come to this island. She knows the visceral feel when fields become houses. But to be a vital and sustainable community there must be room for schools and families. I know your job is difficult, to meet the needs of individuals as well as the community – but hard truth is change is inevitable. I believe what Madrona wants to do to this property is the most Bainbridge use for this property – the Bainbridge I knew from growing up. I feel for all of you that would be impacted by the property, whatever will happen to it. Madrona would be a good neighbor. It's the nature of the school and the heart of the curriculum.

Chair Pearl said the school was applying for a conditional use permit. This activity was allowed in the zone but conditions are placed on it to make it compatible with the zone. They are a recommending body. The final decision is not made by us. Their first job is to come up with conditions to make it compatible with the neighborhood. If that's impossible, then maybe the Hearing Examiner would turn it down. At this stage, the conditions are important. Due to the lateness of the evening, we will push this discussion another meeting.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:08 pm.

Approved by:



J. Mack Pearl, Chair



Lara Lant, Administrative Specialist

PLEASE PRINT

Name	Address	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No	Would like to speak	Subject
David Ward	317 Cave Ave	707-6877		Yes	Bainbridge Lnd.
Neil Johannsen	330 Cave Ave	604-6459		yes	Brain-Landing
CHARRIS Schnitz	ABC			yes	Bainb. Land
✓ Barbara Stuart	11330 Southwind Ct NE			yes	Madrona School
✓ Bill Stuart	11330 Southwind Ct NE	425 417-2125		yes	Madrona School
✓ Pat Eggaas	11330 madison NE	206 842 2037		yes	"
✓ Craig Olson	10705 Hells Hill Rd	858-829-7457		yes/ment	Madrona School
✓ Lisa Foisy	9424 Windsong Loop	206 902 8580		yes	Madrona School
✓ Ana Bucz	11455 Windsong Loop Eastwind Ct NE	206 321 9565		maybe	ll "
✓ Steve Bucz	Windsong loop 11435	425 345 1846		yes	"
✓ Bill Eckert	11300 Southwind CT NE	206-445-4720		Yes	"
✓ Reed Martic	9485 WINDSONG Loop NE	503-332-5902		Y	"
Kim Vernerholm	11478 Mad. son NE	206 234 2674		?	Madrona School



March 9, 2017

[illegible]