



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
REGULAR MEETING
MONDAY, MARCH 18, 2024
2:00 – 5:00 PM
ZOOM WEBINAR +
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

The Design Review Board will hold this meeting in person and using a virtual, Zoom Webinar platform.
Members of the public will be able to attend at city hall or join the Zoom Webinar.

Please click the link below to join the webinar:

<https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/81392576299>

Or One tap mobile :

+12532158782,,81392576299# US (Tacoma)

+12532050468,,81392576299# US

Or Telephone:

Dial(for higher quality, dial a number based on your current location):

+1 360 209 5623 US; +1 253 215 8782 US (Tacoma); +1 253 205 0468 US

Webinar ID: 813 9257 6299

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------|--|
| 2:00 PM | Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics) |
| 2:02 PM | Approval of Minutes – March 4, 2024 |
| 2:05 PM | Deercliff Community (PLN52629 DRB FRR)
Project Manager: Kelly Tayara
#3 Final Review and Recommendation Meeting
<i>See digital file for materials</i> |
| 2:35 PM | Complying with HB 1293 on Design Review Process and Standards |
| 3:05 PM | New/Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Pre-app conference attendees• Board Member Issues/Concerns |
| 3:15 PM | Adjourn |

For special accommodations, please contact Planning & Community Development
206-780-3750 or at pcd@bainbridgewa.gov

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review and Approval of Minutes – February 20, 2024
Helpline House ([PLN52710 DRB DG](#))
Complying with HB 1293 on Design Review Process and Standards
New/Old Business
 Pre-app conference attendees
 Board Member Issues/Concerns/Questions
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Board Member Elaine Liffgens called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. Committee Members in attendance were Bob Russell, Kari Anderson, and Marc Aubin. Chair Todd Thiel was absent and excused. City Council member Jon Quitslund was present. City Staff present were Planning Manager, HB Harper, Planner Joanne Mendenhall, and Administrative Specialist Marlene Schubert who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

Review and Approval of Minutes – February 20, 2024

Motion: I motion to approve minutes from February 20 meeting
Russell/Anderson: Passed Unanimously

Helpline House ([PLN52710 DRB DG](#))
Project Manager: Joanne Mendenhall
#2 Design Guidance Review Meeting
*See attached Helpline House_Design for Bainbridge FINAL Commercial-MF
Worksheet_03042024.pdf*

Complying with HB 1293 on Design Review Process and Standards

- Members reviewed documents presented by HB Harper
- HB 1293 topic will be included as standing agenda item on future agendas

New/Old Business

- Pre-app Conference Attendees
- Board Member Issues/Concerns/Questions

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 3:01 PM.

Approved by:

Todd Thiel, Chair

Marlene Schubert, Administrative Specialist

DRAFT

Attendee Report				
Report Generated:	3/4/2024 15:49			
Topic	Webinar ID	Actual Start Time	Actual Duration (minutes)	Unique Viewers
Design Review Board Regular Meeting - 1st Monday	863 1182 8753	3/4/2024 13:47	74	2
			Total Users	Max Concurrent Views
			4	1
Host Details				
User Name (Original Name)	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)
Marlene Schubert	mschubert@bainbridgewa.gov	3/4/2024 13:47	3/4/2024 15:01	74
Panelist Details				
User Name (Original Name)	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)
Jonathan Davis		3/4/2024 14:00	3/4/2024 14:40	41
Attendee Details				
User Name (Original Name)	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)
pvela		3/4/2024 14:38	3/4/2024 14:54	16
Jonathan Davis		3/4/2024 13:59	3/4/2024 14:00	2



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – REGULAR MEETING
March 4, 2024**

**Want to be added to Listserv?
Check the box and Provide Phone AND Email**

PLEASE PRINT

Name	Affiliation	Phone & Email	
JONATHAN DAVIS	ARCHITECT - HELPCINE		☐
ELAINE LIFFGENS	DRB		☐
Donna Dahlquist	Helpline House		☐
Maria Metzler	Helpline House		☐
Julie Matthews	Helpline House		☐
Joanne Mendenhall	PCD		☐
Kari Anderson	DRB		☐

Page 1 of 2 Bob Russell DRB

(over)



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – REGULAR MEETING
March 4, 2024**

PLEASE PRINT

Want to be added to Listserv?
Check the box and Provide Phone **AND** Email

Name	Affiliation	Phone & Email	
Jon Quitslund	Council		☐
Marja Williams	HH		☐
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐
			☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

PROJECT: Helpline House – PLN52710

PROJECT ADDRESS or PARCEL: 282 KNECHTEL WAY NE / 26250220172002

DATE: 03/04/2024

PROJECT PLANNER: Joanne Mendenhall

Design Review Board Meeting Dates: 02/05/24 CON; 03/04/24 DG

Chapter 3

CONTEXT ANALYSIS

- C1** ANALYZE NATURAL SYSTEMS
- C2** IDENTIFY THE EXTENT AND VALUE OF WILDLIFE HABITAT AND CORRIDORS
- C3** ASSESS UNIQUE AND PROMINENT FEATURES
- C4** CONSIDER THE DEFINING ATTRIBUTES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- C5** ANALYZE SYSTEMS OF MOVEMENT AND ACCESS
- C6** STUDY HOW THE SITE RELATES TO AND CAN CONTRIBUTE TO THE PUBLIC REALM

Context Analysis Complete:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
C1	☒	☐	☐
C2	☒	☐	☐
C3	☒	☐	☐
C4	☒	☐	☐
C5	☒	☐	☐
C6	☒	☐	☐

If marked Does Not Meet, additional information required:



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 4

SITE DESIGN STANDARDS

- S1** PROTECT AND REPAIR NATURAL SYSTEMS
- S2** PRESERVE AND ENRICH WILDLIFE HABITAT
- S3** RESPECT AND MAGNIFY UNIQUE ASPECTS OF SITE AND CONTEXT
- S4** COMPLEMENT AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LOCAL IDENTITY
- S5** FIT THE PROJECT INTO THE SYSTEMS OF ACCESS AND MOVEMENT, PRIORITIZING PEDESTRIANS AND BICYCLES
- S6** SUPPORT AND CONTRIBUTE TO A VIBRANT PUBLIC REALM

Applicant Response – Site Design Standards S1 through S6:

S1 – as a previously developed site there are no natural systems, except some existing mature trees on the perimeter.

S2 – New plantings, in rain gardens, at perimeter will enhance wildlife habitat where possible

S3 – Existing mature trees on the perimeter will be preserved

S4 – By moving the new building to the street the street frontage will be reinforced. The two-story scale of the building will match the scale of other mixed-use and commercial properties on the street.

S5 – The approximate location of the existing driveway will be retained. Pedestrian, accessible access will be enhanced with easy access from the sidewalk and parking area.

S6 – The public realm will be enhanced with the building close to the street and the design of an entry plaza and garden between the sidewalk and front door.

DRB Discussion - Site Design Standards S1 through S6:

DRB Findings – Site Design Standards:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
S1	☒	☐	☐
S2	☒	☐	☐
S3	☒	☐	☐
S4	☒	☐	☐
S5	☒	☐	☐
S6	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 4

PUBLIC REALM STANDARDS

- P1** CREATE A SAFE AND COMFORTABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR WALKING AND CYCLING
- P2** MINIMIZE IMPACT OF VEHICLES ON THE PUBLIC REALM
- P3** DESIGN TO SUPPORT A LEGIBLE HIERARCHY OF PUBLIC SPACES
- P4** STRENGTHEN PUBLIC SPACE CONNECTIONS
- P5** DRAW FROM AND ENHANCE EXISTING BLOCK PATTERNS
- P6** FOSTER INTEREST AND ACTIVITY ALONG COMMERCIAL STREETS

Applicant Response – Public Realm Standards P1 through P6:

P1 – Pedestrian and cyclist safety will be enhanced with the building close to the street and the design of an entry plaza and garden between the sidewalk and front door. Bike parking is located conveniently in this area.

P2 – Vehicular access is along the east side of the building with a sidewalk along it's west edge for pedestrian circulation. Deliveries are segregated behind the building separate from the parking lot.

P3 – The urban public space of the vehicular street is bordered by a sidewalk. From the sidewalk the entry plaza is accessed by walkways. The “one front door” of the building fronts this entry plaza.

P4 – see P3

P5 – this block of Knechtel is a mixed bag of uses, architectural styles, age of buildings etc. but all of the projects have a presence at the street, excepting the current Helpline buildings. This project remedies that by pulling the new building to the street reinforcing the established street edge and providing improved access.

P6 – all of the above foster interest and activity along this mixed-use street.

DRB Discussion - Public Realm Standards P1 through P6:

DRB Findings – Public Realm Standards:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
P1	☒	☐	☐
P2	☒	☐	☐
P3	☒	☐	☐
P4	☒	☐	☐
P5	☒	☐	☐
P6	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 4

BUILDING DESIGN STANDARDS

- B1** EXPRESS A CLEAR ORGANIZING ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT
- B2** USE AN ARCHITECTURAL LANGUAGE APPROPRIATE TO BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
- B3** CREATE WELL COMPOSED FACADES AT ALL SCALES
- B4** CELEBRATE AND PROMINENTLY FEATURE SUSTAINABLE DESIGN
- B5** USE HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS AND WELL - CRAFTED DETAILS

Applicant Response – Building Design Standards B1 through B5:

B1 – the site and building are organized to facilitate the flow of people, vehicles and products. Vehicles are to the east of the site, with delivery vehicles segregated behind, to the north of the building. Food flows from this north unloading area, southwards to sorting and storage and then further south into the market. People enter the building through the “one front door” accessible from the sidewalk or the parking lot, into the lobby then north into the store where food and clients come together. Social services clients enter the same way, then head upstairs to their appointments.

B2 – the language of functionality, simple forms, human scale, shed roofs, maintenance-free exterior materials find an appropriate home on Bainbridge Island.

B3 – articulated, though restrained, forms and materials, artful window placement, sophisticated details, clarity of materials, all contribute to well composed facades.

B4 – The second story roof of the building will provide space for extensive arrays of photovoltaic panels. Raingarden will provide both habitat as well as LID stormwater management.

B5 – High quality materials and well-crafted details will be used on both the exterior and interior.

DRB Discussion - Building Design Standards B1 through B5:

DRB Findings – Building Design Standards:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
B1	☒	☐	☐
B2	☒	☐	☐
B3	☒	☐	☐
B4	☒	☐	☐
B5	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 4 LANDSCAPE STANDARDS

- L1** INTEGRATE THE LANDSCAPE CONCEPT TO COMPLEMENT THE ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPTS
- L2** SUPPORT THE PUBLIC REALM WITH THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN
- L3** INTEGRATE SUSTAINABLE FEATURES INTO THE LANDSCAPE AND MAKE THEM VISIBLE WHEREVER POSSIBLE
- L4** INTEGRATE AND HIGHLIGHT GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PRACTICES
- L5** SUPPORT HEALTHY HABITAT IN THE LANDSCAPE
- L6** PRESERVE AND ENHANCE IMPORTANT VIEWS AND VIEW CORRIDORS

Applicant Response - Landscape Standards L1 through L6:

L1 – public spaces adjacent to the entry of the building and conference room will be framed by landscaping to provide layered screening of to and from the street. Geometries of the building will be extended into the landscaping around the building.

L2 – a series of specimen trees will be planted along the sidewalk adjacent to Knechtel to reinforce the treed aspect of the street as a whole. A large canopy tree will be used to enhance the entry to the entry plaza and a flowering tree (cherry, or similar) will grace the front garden, bringing color to the frontage in spring.

L3 – appropriate plantings in the rain gardens will make them attractive, and features of the overall landscaping. Native plantings on the perimeters support ecological resiliency.

L4 – see L3

L5 – native, edibles, pollinators and other appropriate plant selections will provide health variety to support and active habitat.

L6 – there are no existing view corridors on the site, however, trees described in L2 will frame the building creating pleasant views of the building from the street.

DRB Discussion – Landscape Standards L1 through L6:

DRB Findings – Landscape Standards:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
L1	☒	☐	☐
L2	☒	☐	☐
L3	☒	☐	☐
L4	☒	☐	☐
L5	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

L6 ☐ ☐ ☐

Chapter 5

STREET TYPES AND FRONTAGES

Street Types	Check all that apply
State Route	☐
Main Street	☐
Neighborhood Main Street	☐
Neighborhood Mixed Use	☒
Mixed Use Arterial	☐
Rural by Design	☐
Green Street	☐
Rural Green Street	☐
Frontage Types	Check all that apply
Linear / Storefront	☒
Landscape	☒
Plaza	☒
Forecourt	☒
Stoop / Terrace	☐
Vegetated Buffer	☐
Parking	☐

Applicant Response – Street Types and Frontages:

Knechtel is a loose, mixed use neighborhood street with both commercial spaces and multi-family housing development, that primarily is located close to the street, though in some cases with parking lots along the front property line.

The proposed building will be located 15' from the property line and use aspects various frontage types including Linear/Storefront, Landscape, Plaza/Forecourt to enhance the presence and scale on the street, provide good pedestrian access from the sidewalk and parking lot, provide a transition realm between the street and the building and with landscape soften the urban presence.

DRB Discussion – Street Types and Frontages:

DRB Findings – Street Types and Frontages:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
Street Types	☒	☐	☐
Frontage Types	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 7 **LARGER SITES**

STANDARD 1 DESIGN THE SITE BY CLUSTERING BUILDINGS AND ARRANGING THEM WITH FRONTAGES ON PUBLIC STREETS, PUBLIC SPACES, OR OPEN SPACE.

STANDARD 2 DESIGN SITES TO MINIMIZE THE VISUAL IMPACT OF PARKING ON THE PUBLIC REALM.

Applicant Response - Larger Sites Standard 1 and 2:

The front of this new building is located on the street and the public space of the entry plaza supports this.

The bulk of the parking is located away from the street with only the narrow side of the lot having proximity to the street. Landscaping between the sidewalk and these two parking spaces will screen the vehicles.

DRB Discussion - Larger Sites Standard 1 and 2:

DRB Findings - Larger Sites:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
Standard 1	☒	☐	☐
Standard 2	☒	☐	☐



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 7

HISTORIC PLACES

- STANDARD1** DESIGN THE SITE, BUILDING(s), AND LANDSCAPE TO BE COMPATIBLE WITH HISTORIC BUILDINGS WITHOUT DIRECTLY MIMICKING HISTORIC ARCHITECTURAL STYLES.
- STANDARD2** MAINTAIN THE HISTORIC INTEGRITY OF BUILDINGS OVER 50 YEARS OLD LISTED OR ELIGIBLE FOR THE NATIONAL OR LOCAL REGISTER OF HISTORIC PLACES.

Applicant Response – Historic Places Standards 1 and 2:

HPS 1 – NA. This street is not a historic place or neighborhood and has no historic buildings or context, along with no consistency to the style, design quality etc.

HPS 2 – NA. This is a new building, and the retained existing office building is does not qualify as historic.

DRB Discussion - Historic Places Standard 1 and 2:

DRB Findings - Historic Places:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
Standard 1	☐	☐	☒
Standard 2	☐	☐	☒



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

Chapter 7 CIVIC USES

STANDARD1 DESIGN CIVIC USES AND SITES TO REFLECT AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR FUNCTION AND ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY WHILE BEING CLEARLY IDENTIFIABLE AS A CIVIC USE.

STANDARD2 DESIGN CIVIC SITES AND BUILDINGS TO SERVE MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS SUCH AS PUBLIC SPACE, COMMUNITY GATHERINGS, PUBLIC ART, AND OTHER COMPATIBLE USES.

Applicant Response – Civic Uses Standards 1 and 2:

S1 and S2 – Not Civic Use or Site.

DRB Discussion - Civic Uses Standard 1 and 2:

DRB Findings - Civic Uses:

	Met	Does Not Meet	Not Applicable
Standard 1	☐	☐	☒
Standard 2	☐	☐	☒



Design for Bainbridge Commercial / Multi-Family Housing Worksheet

This project is recommended for:

Approval: ☒

Continue to explore cross connect trails

Approval with the following conditions: ☐

Denial with the following deficiencies: ☐

Todd Thiel

SIGNATURE: _

Chair, Design Review Board

DATE: 03/04/2024



DEPARTMENT OF PLANNING AND COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

Date: February 23, 2024
To: Todd Thiel, Design Review Board Chair, and Design Review Board Members
From: HB Harper, Planning Manager
Re: Design Review Updates

Background

HB 1293 was passed by the legislature in 2023 and takes effect in June, 2025. The bill intends to streamline development regulations and was passed along with a suite of legislation related to housing. This is an opportunity to update COBI's design review process.

HB 1293 – Objective Regulations

The new law requires that cities may apply in any design review process **only clear and objective development regulations** governing the **exterior design** of new development. A “clear and objective” regulation is further defined as “ascertainable,” “by which an applicant can determine whether a given building design is permissible.” The design guidelines “may not reduce density, height, bulk or scale beyond the underlying zone.”

This language sets a new threshold against which **Design for Bainbridge** (“D4B”) must be assessed for compliance. Attached to this memo is a preliminary analysis of how the D4B chapters may need to be amended.

HB 1293 – Public Meeting

In addition to the changes to the D4B manual, the law requires that “design review must be conducted concurrently with the consolidated review and must have only one public meeting.” Thus, the design review process as outlined in D4B and codified in the municipal code must also be changed.

Other Opportunities for Improvement

Because design review will be changing to comply with HB 1293, it is prudent to take this chance to evaluate the process for any *other* improvements that would aid design review in having maximum impact and adding value on permit projects as intended. It has come to staff's attention that several development projects currently under construction or recently constructed have had plans approved as part of building permits with significant design differences from those plans that underwent design review.

This is in part due to a lack of “design review check” in the building permit review process. The plan sets submitted for the land use approval may be more illustrative or conceptual, and as design and engineering details are refined, construction-ready drawings may differ from those earlier concepts. Building permit

submittals are generally evaluated based primarily on municipal code requirements and land use approval conditions, not specific design standards that may have been discussed during design review.

Thus, there are a variety of improvements that can and should be made to the design review process to rectify these issues as part of a package of design review changes. Requiring applicants to document compliance and/or deviations from approved designs during the building permit review phase and would aid establishment of a new staff procedure to check for design review compatibility during the building permit review. Additionally, changes to the design review worksheets that stem from changes to the manual may be helpful in clearly documenting design features that meet the requirements and thus must be checked for during building permit review.

Conclusion

Staff propose to work closely with the Design Review Board (DRB) to make changes to COBI's design review process and manual that both comply with the legislation and also better align the design review process with its intended outcomes.

Attachments

- Work Plan for Design Review Updates
- Preliminary Analysis of D4B
- HB 1293

Design Review Updates Workplan

2024	
March:	Kick off process with Design Review Board (DRB)
	• Discuss schedule
	• Consider how to involve public
April-June:	Staff draft of revised design review guidelines with DRB input
July:	Peer review from Puget Sound Regional Council, Commerce, others
August-September:	Conduct public engagement, receive public comments
October:	Prepare final draft
November-December:	Prepare adopting ordinance
2025	
January-March:	Public hearing with Planning Commission and City Council
June:	Effective date of codified new design review standards and procedures

Preliminary Analysis of D4B for HB 1293 Compliance

The **Context Analysis** includes six requirements, which do not represent standards or guidelines but rather analyses required for the DRB process. These are relatively objective analyses; however, legal advice is warranted as to whether such analyses are permitted since they are not regulations or standards themselves but are rather required deliverables for the design review process.

The Design Standards and Guidelines are comprised of four sections: **Site Design, Public Realm, Building Design, and Landscape Standards.**

Site Design Standards contain guidelines that would not easily meet the language in the bill. Of the six guidelines, S5 “Fit the Project into the Systems of Access and Movement, Prioritizing Pedestrians,” is likely to require the least adjustment to comply with the law. Most of the site design guidelines use verbs that may pose difficulty for an applicant in determining if their design is permissible, such as “promote.” Applicants may not know whether they have sufficiently “promoted” the concepts identified.

Many of the **Public Realm Standards** present similar challenges. P2 “Minimize the Impact of Vehicles on the Public Realm” appears to be the most objective and ascertainable. Example language from these standards that is problematic includes “careful detailing,” “fit the rhythm,” “contribute to the character,” etc.

The **Building Design Standards** are among the most challenging in terms of compliance with the law. “Thoughtful detailing,” “graceful composition,” etc., represent laudable design goals but are entirely subjective in nature. These standards will likely require significant revision to comply.

The **Landscape Standards** represent somewhat more objective concepts, such as locating vegetation to support stormwater or provide shading, although the concepts seem somewhat aspirational as stated (several of the landscape standards include language such as “where appropriate” or otherwise imply a sense of being somewhat optional). This section may require only minor revisions to clarify how an applicant can determine whether their design meets the standards or not.

The guidelines for **Street Frontage Types** are similarly aspirational, although the permitted frontages table (page 58) provides some clarity. Minor revisions will likely be necessary.

The **Subdivision Guidelines** build on many of the Site Design Standards and other concepts throughout D4B; they therefore share issues previously identified and will require revisions.

The **Supplemental Standards** may be among the most ascertainable, perhaps because of their specificity (large sites, historic places, civic uses). Minor revisions may be warranted, but these standards can likely remain largely intact.