
AGENDA

- 7:00 PM CALL TO ORDER
 Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
- 7:05 PM REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES
 November 10, 2016
 November 29, 2018
 December 13, 2018
- 7:15 PM ELECT PLANNING COMMISSION CHAIR AND VICE-CHAIR
- 7:25 PM PUBLIC COMMENT
 Accept public comment on off agenda items.
- 7:30 PM PLANNING COMMISSION REVIEW PROCESS
 Discussion
 Gary R. Christensen, AICP, Planning Director
- 8:00 PM SUBDIVISION UPDATE
 Landscape Buffer Requirements
 Study Session
 Christy Carr, AICP, Long Range Senior Planner
- 8:50 PM NEW/OLD BUSINESS
- 9:00 PM ADJOURN

***** TIMES ARE ESTIMATES****

Public comment time at meeting may be limited to allow time for Commissioners to deliberate. To provide additional comment to the City outside of this meeting, e-mail us at pcd@bainbridgewa.gov or write us at Planning and Community Development, 280 Madison Avenue, Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

**For special accommodations, please contact Jane Rasely, Planning & Community
Development 206-780-3758 or at jrasely@bainbridgewa.gov**

This page left intentionally blank.

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

PUBLIC COMMENT: Accept public comment on off agenda items

ORDINANCE 2016-28 LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS - Public Hearing & Recommendation

ISLAND-WIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN - Discussion & Recommendation

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

ADJOURN

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

Vice-Chair William Chester called the meeting to order at 6:38 p.m. Commissioners in attendance were Michael Lewars, Maradel Gale, Jon Quitslund and Michael Killion. Mack Pearl and Lisa Macchio were absent and excused. Staff present were Public Works Director Barry Loveless, Planning Director Gary Christensen, Engineering Manager Chris Hammer, Senior City Planner Jennifer Sutton, NPDES Permit Coordinator Marilyn Guthrie and Development Engineer Janelle Hitch. Sitting in for Jane Rasely was Kelly Jahraus, Executive Department who monitored the recording of the meeting and began the minutes which were subsequently completed by Jane Rasely.

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept public comment on off agenda items

None offered.

ORDINANCE 2016-28 LOW IMPACT DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS - Public Hearing & Recommendation

The Public Hearing was opened at 6:39 PM.

Public Works Director Barry Loveless provided an overview of the Low Impact Development program using a PowerPoint presentation then provided the Commissioners with a time of question and answer.

PUBLIC COMMENT

Charles Schmid wanted to address the process saying there were sections in Ordinance 2016-28 that dealt with vegetation that needed to be examined. He felt they should close the hearing and then reopen the ordinance to address that.

Jacqueline Young, Citizen – Asked if the LID would examine the problem of large footprints with very little garden space for water to return to the ground.

Ross Hathaway, Citizen and President of Squeaky Wheels - Asked for marked bicycle lanes to be exempt from the definition of pollution generating impervious surfaces and the exemption of redevelopment of existing compacted shoulders into bicycle lanes or dedicated pedestrian facilities from the water quality and quantity mitigation requirements. Rebecca Pogolowski (Consultant) responded to Mr. Hathaway's requests.

Tim Wentzel, Citizen and Secretary of Squeaky Wheels – Asked for wider bike lanes.

Public Hearing was closed at 7:25 PM.

Commissioners asked to see a final, clean copy before providing a recommendation on November 16, 2016.

ISLAND-WIDE TRANSPORTATION PLAN: Discussion & Recommendation

Engineering Manager, Chris Hammer provided an overview of the revised document.



**Planning Commission
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
Thursday, November 10, 2016**

Public Comment

Tim Wentzel, Citizen and Secretary of Squeaky Wheels - Seeing a lot more traffic on Miller Road and proposed any bike lane going up a hill should be 5 feet wide.

Richard Potter, Citizen – Stated 5-foot bike lanes were better and that they worked well on Ferncliff.

Squeaky Wheels Member – Spoke in favor of Core 40 program and education from employers to their employees about various commuting options. She spoke against turning Highway 305 into a big freeway.

Elizabeth Osnic, Citizen – Spoke in favor of Core 40 and safety.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Provided specific comments on text within the IWTP and asked the Planning Commission to look at his notes.

Ross Hathaway, Citizen and Squeaky Wheels President – Spoke about making safety priority one and removing the three-foot facility.

Motion: I recommend that we recommend approval of the Island Wide Transportation Plan with the addition of those things that were pointed out this evening and I think Chris has most of those, I hope, and a bunch of small things.

Lewars/Gale: Passed Unanimously

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

Meeting adjourned at 9:03 PM.

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items
SMP AMENDMENT STATUS – Briefing
SUBDIVISION UPDATE – Study Session
PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR - Discussion
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

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

Chair William Chester called the meeting to order at 7:02 PM. Planning Commissioners in attendance were J. Mack Pearl, Jon Quitslund, Kimberly McCormick Osmond and Don Doman. Lisa Macchio and Michael Killion were absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Director Gary Christensen, Long Range Senior Planner Christy Carr and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. There were not any conflicts disclosed.

PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items

None

SMP AMENDMENT STATUS – Briefing

Senior Planner Christy Carr provided a briefing and overview of the next steps for the SMP Amendment.

Public Comment

Dick Haugan, Citizen – Asked how preparing for the June 2020 review would determine whether the SMP is working or not? He also asked for a definition of “no net loss” to be part of the future conversation.

Steve Bonkowski, Citizen – Encouraged the Planning Commission to work diligently with the Planning Staff to be ready for the June 2020 periodic update deadline.

SUBDIVISION UPDATE – Study Session

Ms. Carr provided an overview of the revisions to date being reviewed.

Motion: I move the following: to recommend that the land use review procedures in BIMC 2.1 for subdivisions, major CUPs, and major SPRs be revised as shown in the document “Review Procedures for Major Projects,” as amended, and as needed to ensure consistency with that document.

Quitslund/McCormick Osmond: Passed Unanimously

PLANNING COMMISSION CALENDAR - Discussion

Upcoming meeting agenda items were reviewed. It was decided the December 13, 2018 meeting would begin at 6:30 PM and the briefing by ECONorthwest and Forterra would be first on the agenda.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:55 PM

Approved by:

William Chester, Chair

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
REVIEW OF MINUTES – October 25, 2018 and November 8, 2018
INCLUSIONARY ZONING/TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Briefing
SUBDIVISION UPDATE – Study Session
PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

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

Chair William Chester called the meeting to order at 6:33 PM. Commissioners in attendance were J. Mack Pearl, Jon Quitslund, Lisa Macchio, Kimberly McCormick Osmond and Don Doman. City Staff present were Planning Director Gary Christensen, Long Range Senior Planners Jennifer Sutton and Christy Carr and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. There were not any conflicts noted.

REVIEW OF MINUTES – October 25, 2018 and November 8, 2018

Commissioner Quitslund asked for the word “completely” (page 1, last line of November 8 minutes) to be changed to “completing.”

Motion: I move the approval of the minutes for October 25 and November 8 of this year with the one typo corrected in the November 8 minutes.

Quitslund/Pearl: Passed unanimously.

PUBLIC COMMENT – Accept public comment on off agenda items

Michael Zigich, Citizen – Asked for clarification from the Planning Commission about their recommendations to City Council for the Shoreline Master Plan Amendment.

INCLUSIONARY ZONING/TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS – Briefing

Long Range Senior Planner Jennifer Sutton
City Consultant Erik Rundell, ECONorthwest and Forterra .

Public Comment

Jeb Thornburg, Citizen – Spoke in favor of Transfer of Development Rights and neighborhood service centers accommodating development.

Charlie Wenzlau, Citizen – Reminded the Planning Commission that the Affordable Housing Task Force did make recommendations about increasing base zoning specifically in the High School Road Zone and in the Ferry Terminal.

Jonathan Davis, Citizen – Spoke in favor of projects that wanted to create affordable house (referencing Bethany Lutheran) and saw TDR's as a great way to serve their needs and desires and mentioned a limited number of prime sites that should be looked at as places that TDR's could be used.

Tom Golon, Citizen – Spoke in favor of allowing more ADU's and Island Center as an area that could be developed more.

SUBDIVISION UPDATE – Study Session

Long Range Senior Planner Christy Carr

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

Planning Director Gary Christensen presented the planned schedule for January and February and provided an update on recent City Council actions.

The Commission agreed by consensus to ask for a new appointee to the Planning Commission to replace Commissioner Michael Killion who recently resigned.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 8:21 PM.

Approved by:

William Chester, Chair

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist



SUBDIVISION REGULATIONS UPDATE

LANDSCAPE BUFFER REQUIREMENTS

NOTE: Refer to BIMC [18.15.010](#) for existing landscape requirements.

Landscape Buffer Requirements: Existing perimeter buffers (along exterior boundary)

- Only required for cluster subdivision flexlot option
- Not required for subdivisions on property with a gross area of less than one acre
- Perimeter buffers may be included in the required open space calculations for a subdivision
- Buildings not allowed in perimeter buffers [Note: adjacent properties have yard setbacks up to 25 feet]
- In R-0.4, R-1, R-2 and R-2.9 districts, a **25-foot-wide, edge planting standard** landscape perimeter is required
- No perimeter buffer required in other zoning districts
- Multifamily subdivisions in R-0.4, R-1, R-2 and R-2.9 districts require a **25-foot-wide, full screen planting standard**
- The largest perimeter buffer island-wide is a **50-foot-wide, full screen planting standard**, required between the Business/Industrial zone and any other zoning district (the buffer for waste transfer facilities can be increased to up to 100 feet)
- Commercial districts (Winslow Town Center Mixed Use, HSR I and II, and NC) require a **20-foot-wide, full screen planting standard** adjacent to single-family residential districts; can be reduced with buffer averaging to 15 feet

Policy Questions:

- Should perimeter buffers be required in all zoning districts?
- Is 25 feet the appropriate width for a perimeter buffer?
- Is the edge planting standard the appropriate standard?
- Is a “flexible buffer” or “buffer averaging” appropriate based on adjacent development pattern?
- Should the perimeter buffer be allowed to be included in natural area or community space? [ARPA may include landscape buffers.]
- Should any encroachment be permitted in perimeter buffer? [See Table 18.12.040, Permitted Height/Setback Modifications]

Landscape Buffer Requirements: Existing roadside buffers (frontage road; not internal access/street)

- The type and width of the required buffer varies by the type of roadway the subdivision is adjacent to, as well as the condition of the existing roadside vegetation.
- Not required for subdivisions on property with a gross area of less than one acre
- Only applies to properties located adjacent to collector or arterial roads
- Roadside buffers may be included in the required open space calculations for a subdivision
- For subdivisions designating open space that is intended for agricultural use and would be adversely impacted by the addition of screening landscaping, a 25-foot roadside buffer as is not required.
- Multifamily and commercial subdivisions require a minimum 50-foot full screen buffer shall be established adjacent to all designated scenic roads (only applies to Highway 305).
- In the R-0.4, R-1, R-2 and R-2.9 districts, a **25-foot-wide full screen roadside buffer is required**.
- In the R-3.5, R-4.3, R-5, R-6, R-8 and R-14 districts **a roadside buffer is not required** unless it is determined that a landscape buffer is necessary to maintain the character of the neighborhood or to reflect neighboring development patterns.
- For short subdivisions, 25-foot buffer can be reduced or eliminated to accommodate an existing house or existing roadside vegetation pattern.

Policy Questions:

- Should roadside buffers be required in all zoning districts?
- Should roadside buffers be required for all road classifications?
- Is 25 feet the appropriate width for a roadside buffer?
- Is the full screen planting standard the appropriate standard?
- Is a “flexible buffer” or “buffer averaging” appropriate based on adjacent development pattern?
- Should the roadside buffer be allowed to be included in natural area or community space?
[ARPA may include landscape buffers.]
- Should any encroachment be permitted in the roadside buffer? [See Table 18.12.040, Permitted Height/Setback Modifications]

Planting Standards for Landscape Buffers (BIMC 18.15.010.D.4)

Edge Planting Standard. Where edge planting standard perimeter landscaping is required, the applicant must provide:

- i. One hundred percent deciduous trees two-inch caliper spaced no more than 30 feet on center; and
- ii. Evergreen shrubs minimum 21 inches in height at the time of planting spaced no more than three feet on center to provide a continuous hedge achieving a maximum height of six feet at maturity; and
- iii. Living ground cover shall be planted and spaced to achieve total coverage within five years.

Full Screen Standard. The intent of this buffer is to provide an effective vegetated screen over time between uses, land use districts, or to screen parking areas and structures from the public rights-of-way. Where full screen perimeter landscaping is required, the applicant must provide:

- i. Minimum 70 percent evergreen trees ranging in height from four feet to six feet at the time of planting with at least 50 percent being six feet high; and
- ii. Deciduous trees with a caliper of at least two inches at the time of planting; and
- iii. At least 50 percent of the trees shall be native species or drought resistant; and
- iv. The number of trees is determined by calculating the area of the perimeter buffer and dividing by 250 square feet, or one tree for every 10 feet of buffer length, whichever is greater; and
- v. Minimum 70 percent evergreen shrubs at least 21 inches in height at the time of planting, to achieve minimum six feet height at maturity; and
- vi. The number of shrubs is determined by calculating the area of the perimeter buffer and dividing by 50 square feet or one shrub for every 20 feet of buffer length, whichever is greater; and
- vii. Living ground cover shall be planted and spaced to achieve total coverage within five years; and
- viii. Trees and shrubs shall be spaced to result in a full screen over time.

Table 18.12.040: Permitted Setback/Height Modifications

Type of Encroachment	Encroachment Permitted	Conditions
Permitted Setback Modifications		
Fence or combined fence and berm up to 6 feet high	In any required setback subject to applicable regulations in BIMC Title 15	Except as provided in BIMC 18.12.040 .B and Chapter 16.12 BIMC
Nonscreening fences or combined nonscreening fence and berm up to 8 feet high	In any required setback subject to applicable regulations in BIMC Title 15	Except as provided in Chapter 16.12 BIMC
Chimneys, flues, awnings, bay windows, and greenhouse windows	Up to 18 inches into any required setback	
Covered porches, bay windows and eaves within the Ericksen Avenue overlay district	Up to 5 feet into the front yard	Bay windows must be cantilevered outward from the wall, and may not result in any portion of the building floor area extending into the setback
Any structures, including but not limited to uncovered steps, porches, and decks less than or equal to 30 inches in height	Up to 2 feet into front and side setbacks. Up to 5 feet into required rear setbacks.	
Eaves	May extend up to 24 inches in any required setback except shoreline structure setback	
At or near grade structures such as uncovered patios, sidewalks, and driveways	In any required setback	May not exceed 4 inches in height
Signs	In any required setback	Must conform to Chapter 15.08 BIMC
Utilities accessory to a single-family residence	In any required setback	
Composting bins	In side or rear setback areas	
Bioretention/rain gardens	In any required setback	In accordance with Chapter 15.20 BIMC
Rain barrels/cisterns	In any required setback	In accordance with Chapter 15.20 BIMC
Wall-mounted on-demand hot water heaters	Up to 18 inches into side or rear setbacks	Permitted if buffered or enclosed to prevent noise impacts to neighboring properties
Below-ground geothermal equipment	In any required setback	Permitted if any excavated areas are promptly relandscaped after installation is complete
Rockeries and retaining walls less than 4 feet in height	In any required setback	Qualified geotechnical engineer determination, and city concurrence, that it is necessary for slope stabilization
Public communications tower	In any required setback subject to applicable regulations in BIMC Title 15	Must conform to Chapters 16.12 and 16.20 BIMC

CHAPTER 3 OPERATIONS AND MOBILITY



This chapter describes the traffic operations and current and future vehicle mobility for the City's roadway system. Mobility is the measure of how well vehicles can get around on the roadway system – the opposite of congestion. Island residents expect a high level of mobility that maintain the character of their community. The high levels of congestion experienced during peak periods, especially on and around SR 305, are a common source of frustration for drivers.

While the focus of this chapter is on motorized level of service, it is recognized that providing for level of service for all modes is important for a viable transportation system. In some locations where constraints limit options, some modes may be favored over other modes. Transportation networks should provide for all modes of transportation as a system. For vehicular traffic, transportation demand strategies may be an optimal approach.

Level of service standards are used to provide a basis for the mobility analysis. This plan used planning and operational models developed by Transportation Solutions, Inc. in TransCAD and Synchro software, respectively, to analyze current conditions (based on traffic counts and existing roadway network information) and to forecast future levels of service (based on traffic generated by forecasted land use and roadway network changes). The structure of the roadway network was analyzed by reviewing the roadway classification system, connectivity, access, and road standards.

Existing Roadway System

The section on existing conditions provides an analysis of the current operating conditions and provides a baseline for future comparisons. The City of Bainbridge Island's transportation system is made up of a network of roadways, pedestrian facilities, bikeways, the ferry terminal, and formal and informal trails. Each of these elements is important to the mobility or movement of people and goods within and to destinations beyond the Island. This chapter focuses on the roadway system only; the non-motorized, bus transit, and ferry systems are described in Chapters 6 and 7.

The roadway system is designed for the movement of people and goods throughout the community. Major regional transportation features of the Island include the Washington State Ferry Terminal, which connects Bainbridge Island to downtown Seattle; and SR 305, which connects the Island to the Kitsap and Olympic Peninsula. SR 305 is the Island's principal transportation corridor, providing an important north-south connection.





The State system is supported by a City roadway system that connects residential areas to the highway and retail and employment areas. The City's arterial, collector, and residential street system provides roadway connections and access to properties within the City.

Travel Corridors

The following important commuter, shopping, business, school, and freight/commercial corridors are identified for the Island:

- *Commute Corridors* – SR 305, Winslow Way, Wyatt Way, Ferncliff Avenue, High School Road, Day Road, Blakely Avenue, Eagle Harbor Drive, Baker Hill Road, Miller Road, and North Madison Avenue.
- *Retail Corridors* – SR 305, Winslow Way, High School Road, Madison Avenue, Hildebrand, Miller Road, Wyatt Way, Lynwood Center Road, and Valley Road.
- *School Corridors* – High School Road, New Brooklyn Road, Sportsman's Club Road, Madison Avenue, Day Road, North Madison Avenue, and Blakely Avenue
- *Freight Corridors* – SR 305, Day Road, Miller Road, Fletcher Bay Road, Sportsman's Club Road, High School Road, Madison Avenue, and Winslow Way.

Roadway Inventory

The City's roadway system consists of approximately 140 miles of paved roads, and another 20 miles of unpaved roads. The City maintains a Geographic Information System (GIS) that includes the roadway system. The GIS database includes characteristics for each roadway segment, including length, pavement width, functional classification, posted speed, sidewalks, and transit and bicycle facilities. A spreadsheet is maintained that includes sign inventory information. The City periodically conducts an island-wide traffic count and develops volume and traffic speed information for its major roadways. This plan was updated in 2014 with TSI traffic counts shown in Appendix C.

Roadway Classifications

Roadway functional classification is defined as the process by which streets and highways are grouped into classes, or systems, according to the character of traffic service that they are intended to provide. The City divides Island roadways into four functional classifications: principal arterial, secondary arterial, collector, and local access roads. These classifications are described in Table 3-1.

Table 3-1. Functional Classifications

Classification	Definition
Principal Arterial	Carry the highest levels of traffic in the system at the greatest speed for the longest uninterrupted distance, often with some degree of access control. Used for through trips, and provide connections within the system.
Secondary Arterial	Carry high level of traffic at a moderate speed, sometimes for through trips. Often serve as access to high-intensity land uses such as major employers or larger commercial centers; provide connections within the system.
Collector	Connect traffic from residential roads to arterials at a lower speed, carrying lower levels of traffic than arterials. Serve neighborhood centers.
Local Access	Carry low levels of traffic at low speeds. Serve as access to residential and commercial areas and are not used for through trips.



Streets and highways are assigned one of these classes, depending on the character of the traffic (i.e., local or long distance) and the degree of land access that they allow. Typically, a trip will use a combination of different road classes, with each classification having a specific function with regard to access and travel speed. Arterials provide a high degree of mobility and less access, while local access roads provide a high level of access and less mobility. Collectors provide a balance between access and mobility and connect the system.

Road Standards

The City of Bainbridge Island has established its roadway street and design standards as part of its *Engineering Design and Construction Standards and Specifications*. These standards set the minimum requirements for constructing roadways and are applicable to all new roadway construction and modifications to existing roadways within the City of Bainbridge Island. The road and street design standards follow the functional classification system described above and establish separate standards for designated centers and the conservation area of the Island.

The City has both urban and suburban standards. Urban standards are intended to apply within the designated center of Winslow, the neighborhood centers including Lynwood, Island Center, and Rolling Bay, and the Day Road Industrial Center. Urban standards apply in all locations with R2.9 and greater zoning and/or effective density. The City may require urban standards to be applied in other areas in close proximity for system continuity.

Level of Service

This section describes the Level of Service (LOS) standards used in this document. LOS provides a method for measuring the performance of the transportation system. The City uses a standard for LOS that determines if adequate mobility is being provided on the roadway system. LOS standards and method of measurement have been coordinated with Washington State Department of Transportation, Washington State Ferries, Kitsap County, and Kitsap Transit to ensure that standards used in this document are consistent with these other entities.

