



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING
MONDAY, AUGUST 7, 2017
2:00 – 5:00 PM
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 2:00 PM | Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics) |
| 2:05 PM | Review and Approval of Minutes
June 19, 2017 |
| 2:10 PM | Sound to Olympics Trail Presentation
Mark Epstein, RLA
Engineering Project Manager |
| 2:45 PM | Work Session |
| 3:45 PM | New/Old Business |
| 5:00 PM | Adjourn |

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review and Approval of Minutes – May 15, 2017
Assistance Dogs PLN50504 PRE
Work Session
Planning Director Gary Christensen - Project Review Update
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Alan Grainger called the meeting to order at 2:17 pm. Design Review Board (DRB) members in attendance were Jim McNett, Joseph Dunstan, and Peter Perry. Jeff Boon, Jason Wilkinson and Chris Gutsche were absent and excused. City staff present were Planning Director Gary Christensen, Senior Planner Heather Wright and Administrative Specialist Lara Lant who recorded the meeting and prepared minutes. No conflicts were disclosed.

Review and Approval of Minutes – May 15, 2017

Review of minutes postponed until after Assistance Dogs Project Review.

Assistance Dogs PLN50504 PRE

Senior Planner Heather Wright updated the DRB on the status of the Assistance Dogs project. The applicant met with city staff to confirm an educational facility was an allowed use in the district. It was determined that a site plan review and conditional use permit would be required. A public participation meeting was held and the project was well received by attendees. Stacy Goodfellow of Assistance Dogs NW said there would be minimal changes to existing structures, some minor interior changes and no additional structures were planned. A wheelchair ramp to the main house would be constructed and existing driveway and parking areas would be paved. They planned to build a fence along Miller Road and the driveway.

Joe Dunstan spoke about potential accessibility issues and the Americans with Disabilities Act (ADA). He wanted to ensure Assistance Dogs made all the ADA improvements required. Ms. Goodfellow said they would hire an architect to design those improvements. Mr. Dunstan said “accessible route” drawings were required by some municipalities but not by the City of Bainbridge Island. He would like to see a separate drawing of all the routes from the parking area to the facilities. Alan Grainger recommended a civil engineer create these drawings.

Alan Grainger noted documentation necessary for formal site plan review: Drawings showing Point A to Point B access, including ramps; site plans, identifying buildings and including elevations if buildings are visible from the street; clear photographs, including aerial photographs. Heather Wright said the project will return to the Design Review Board at the Site

Plan Review and Conditional Use Permit application review. The project would then go before the Planning Commission as well as the Hearing Examiner for final decision. The city would solicit further public input during the process.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES – May 15, 2017

The minutes were reviewed.

Motion: I move to approve the minutes of May 15, 2017 as written.

McNett/Perry: The motion carried 4-0.

Work Session

The Work Session was postponed until after New/Old Business

New/Old Business

Mark Epstein, the city's engineering project manager for the Sound to Olympic Trail (STO) project requested the Design Review Board consider reviewing the bridge portion of the project. If they were interested, he would return to a future DRB meeting and give a short presentation. Peter Perry thanked Mark Epstein for offering this opportunity to the DRB as he was under no obligation to do so. It was agreed that Mark Epstein would return to the Design Review Board on August 7th.

Work Session

The DRB discussed the Latimore Report.

Planning Director Gary Christensen – Project Review Update

Director Gary Christensen answered questions from the DRB: ***When the DRB makes recommendations, how do you know those recommendations are put into effect?*** The development review process can be monitored and final decisions can be read to confirm how your recommendations were addressed. The DRB is an advisory board and its recommendations are informative and helpful. On matters that have come before the DRB, staff can send an email with a link to the final decision, including project conditions.

Alan Grainger said he wanted staff to have a system in place to see that recommendations and decisions were being followed. Gary Christensen replied that certificates of occupancy would not be issued until conditions were met. In some cases, assurances and bonds are required to ensure long term conditions are met. Alan Grainger said sometimes projects are transferred to staff who are not made aware of all the conditions.

Jim McNett: ***Do planners follow projects through the building part of the process?*** Inspectors, plan check reviewers and project planners follow the process. All the information should be in the electronic file and available for everyone, including the public, to review.

Peter Perry: ***How are DRB recommendations added to the record?*** Senior Planner Heather Wright responded that their comments and recommendations via meeting minutes are recorded, attached to the electronic file and incorporated into staff reports. Planners generally add DRB recommendations as conditions in their staff reports unless they are not legally able to do so. The city has 120 days to issue a decision on a project and the DRB usually sees projects within the first 30-40 days. Director Gary Christensen said once the certificate of occupancy has been issued, planning staff don't have resources to follow up that conditions are being met. The Site Area Review/Latimore Report has offered some tools and mechanisms to address project condition compliance and monitoring. Staff can provide electronic links to final decisions of projects reviewed by the DRB.

Director Gary Christensen discussed the roles and responsibilities of the Design Review Board. Decision making authority, including review of subdivision and public buildings must be changed via city code. He pointed out the city had regulatory requirements and time constraints in all project review. Alan Grainger asked if City Council had to request the Design Review Board to review the Sound to Olympic bridge, because it was outside of their current review scope. Gary Christensen replied that the request was a courtesy request by the project manager because he thought their review would benefit the project. The DRB could say yes or no to the request. Alan Grainger said expansion of project review was further complicated because they didn't yet have standards to apply during review. Gary Christensen said not just standards but good Design Guidelines, Development Code, and Administrative Manual would ultimately determine good design. Gary Christensen said the Latimore Report suggested a Citizen Client Advisory Board (CCAB) would bring together an integrated group of professionals and citizens to discuss these ideas and concepts to make the review process better.

Design Review Notebook Gary Christensen stated it would be ok to have a notebook of good designs. Jim McNett said they would add a disclaimer to the notebook, stating it contained representative images which were part of the public record and not recommended by the city. For the less sophisticated applicant, the notebook would illustrate document requirements. Gary Christensen concluded the conversation with an invitation to attend the Joint City Council/Planning Commission meeting the following night.

Adjourn

The meeting adjourned at 4:46 pm.

Approved by:

Alan Grainger, Chair

Lara Lant, Administrative Specialist

1. Is the bridge project a done deal? Has the City Council approved it?

No project is a done deal until it has been constructed, however much planning work has already occurred to get the project to this stage. Four potential highway crossing routes were examined as part of the design process for the STO Trail. Our analysis concluded that the best crossing location for the bridge is at Knechtel Way and John Nelson Lane. A successful grant application in partnership with Washington State Ferries provided the construction funding. Earlier this year the City Council approved a contract with Otak for the bridge design. The meeting on July 26 is the first of many community design meetings to discuss aspects of the project that are important to the community, and what character the bridge should have. Additionally, City Council will have several opportunities during the design process to evaluate the project and provide ongoing direction.

2. Couldn't the money be spent on something else, like planting along the trail, other island trails, or undergrounding power lines on Winslow?

The grant funding (approximately \$2M) for construction can be used only for the bridge project. If we do not pursue this project the funds will be forfeited and will not be available to the City for other uses. Federal grant funding through the PSRC Regional Competition is only available for regionally significant projects such as the STO trail, and therefore does not take away from grant program sources used to fund other desired transportation projects in the City's Capital Improvement Plan. The design contract with Otak (approximately \$628,000) is funded by the City, as is another \$408,000 for construction as a grant match. These funds were budgeted for this project in the Capital Improvement Plan, but funds not already expended could conceivably be allocated to other projects.

3. Can the approaches to the bridge meet ADA standards for slope gradients?

There are many options for the approaches to the bridge, none of which have yet to be developed. The consultants will study various approaches to get up to the bridge deck on both sides of the highway, and provide analyses on the relative costs, impacts, and benefits of each alternative. The options for the approaches will be publicized and presented at a future meeting for community feedback.

4. Who will use the bridge? Won't it benefit only the Vineyard Lane condo residents?

There are many potential beneficiaries of the proposed bridge. Certainly, the residents of the Vineyard Lane condos and other neighborhoods on the east side of SR305 would no longer need to make a dangerous crossing of the highway, as some do now, to get to the commercial core. However, a bridge would provide a connection to the STO trail to greater populations in the higher-density town center. The bridge will serve a broader spectrum of user groups, including families with children, elders, and those with mobility limitations, allowing them to get to destinations in town without a vehicle. The bridge could also provide a new transit connection along the west side of the highway.

While it's difficult to predict how many people would be served, foreseeable users include: kids from the Ferry District and Wing Point neighborhoods heading to schools or the library; residents in the Commodore community and surrounding neighborhoods heading to the ferry; bicycle commuters from the ferry heading to the south end or northwest parts of the island; residents in the "Cliff" neighborhoods going into Winslow for groceries or other shopping; and anyone wishing to take a stroll around the new John Nelson Trail. In general, the bridge would provide a safer, more convenient, and more direct route between the ferry district on the east side and the

commercial districts on the west side of SR305, linking neighborhoods now separated by the highway.

5. Why not a stop light or controlled crossing at John Nelson Lane (Vineyard Lane), to act as calming for the straight stretch between Winslow and High School?

As a state highway subject to ferry-unloading traffic surges, traffic calming is not warranted on this segment of SR305. An at-grade crossing was considered at John Nelson Lane, but was disregarded because the costs for a control signal (even a HAWK crosswalk beacon) are high, it could cause longer ferry unloading times, and would provide a less desirable crossing that may not be an effective safety enhancement.

6. Why is a bridge needed after the new shared-use trail running from Winslow Way to High School Road is completed? Why not just cross at the existing intersections?

A mid-block crossing between Winslow Way and High School has been identified in past planning efforts to eliminate the barrier between the east and west sides of central Bainbridge created by the highway, and expanding the connectivity network of this area. The Ferry/Gateway District Urban Design Plan (April, 2007) recommended “reservation of public easements east of the termini of Wallace, Knechtel, and Wyatt Ways to allow for future bicycle/pedestrian connections across SR305 and the Winslow Ravine to Ferncliff Avenue as part of a larger trail network.”

Planning is ongoing with adjacent property owners to provide future connections between the proposed bridge and Ferncliff. With large new residential projects likely at Bainbridge Landing, the property south of McDonald’s, and the property north of Vineyard Lane, there will be a large pool of potential bridge users in the future. Higher densities are allowed in these areas because of the proximity of essential services that could be reached without the use of a vehicle. On the west side of SR305, a network of low traffic roadways and trail connections exist that would link to the proposed bridge at Knechtel Way.

Additionally, intersections are one of the most dangerous places for pedestrians, and can be a deterrent to walking or bicycling for many residents. The intersections at Winslow Way and at High School Road are the widest and busiest intersections on the island, and create the longest delays to crossing.

7. Why not tunnel under the highway instead?

We examined tunneling under the highway as part of the trail planning process. A tunnel was studied in two locations, at the ravine near Wyatt Way, or near Wallace Way. In both cases the tunneling option was more expensive than any overpass option, mostly because the approaches on both sides of the highway would require extensive grading, retaining walls, and bridging to access the tunnel. The tunnel option near Wyatt would also have excessive environmental impacts to the ravine. Additionally, tunnels are less preferred by trail users and perceived as more dangerous to personal safety. Ultimately the tunnel options were discarded because of these considerations.

8. Will the bridge be ugly? Will it reflect Bainbridge character?

Although beauty is subjective, great effort will be made to construct a bridge that is aesthetically pleasing to the community and reflects the character of the island. A representative from the Public Art Committee is an integral member of the design team. In addition to seeking feedback from the community at-large, we will also be advised by members of the Historic Preservation Commission, Multi-modal Transportation Advisory Committee, Planning Commission, Design Review Board, and numerous other island groups throughout the design process. City staff and the City Council will provide guidance and oversight as the design evolves. We realize the importance of this project to the visual character of the island, and it’s our intention to make this bridge an admirable and archetypal addition to the island.