



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, JUNE 25, 2015
6:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON**

- 6:00 PM CALL TO ORDER**
Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
- 6:05 PM PUBLIC COMMENT**
Accept Public Comment on off agenda items
- 6:10 PM REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES**
April 23 and May 14, 2015 Planning Commission Meetings
- 6:15 PM PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**
- 6:25 PM 2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**
- Review and confirm proposed recommendations on the *Introduction*
 - Continue discussion of *Land Use Element* with a focus on:
 - Confirm “Housekeeping” changes
 - Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) policies
 - Neighborhood Service Center (NSC) policies
- 8:40 PM PUBLIC COMMENT ON COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE**
- 8:55 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



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, APRIL 23, 2015
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON**

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on Off-agenda Items
REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 26, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Discuss Creating a Subcommittee to Assist with Drafting
Comp Plan Amendments
ORDINANCE 2015-10 TENT CITY REGULATIONS - Study Session
ORDINANCE 2015-04 LANDSCAPING AND TREE PROTECTION - Study Session
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

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

Chair J. Mack Pearl called the meeting to order at 7:01 PM. Other Commissioners also in attendance were Maradel Gale, Michael Lewars and Julie Kriegh. Commissioners John Thomas, Michael Lewars and William Chester were absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Director Kathy Cook and Special Project Planner Jennifer Sutton. Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely monitored recording and prepared minutes.

No conflicts of interest.

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on Off-agenda Items

None.

REVIEW AND APPROVAL OF MINUTES - March 26, 2015 Planning Commission Meeting

Commissioner Gale pointed out an omission on page 3 of the word "one" when describing the bucket comprehensive plan items will be placed in and Commissioner Kriegh corrected information on page 2 pertaining to her comments about the Rosebud II project.

**Motion: I move we approve the minutes of March 26, 2015 with corrections as noted.
Quitslund/Gale: Motion carried 4-0**

**2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Discuss Creating a Subcommittee to Assist with Drafting
Comp Plan Amendments**

Director Cook spoke about public comment received since the last Planning Commission meeting. She presented the idea of having a sub-committee from the Planning Commission help draft changes to the comp plan. Commissioners Quitslund and Gale volunteered and Commissioner Kriegh stated she would be

available after July 1st. Commissioner Quitslund asked what form the new amendments would be taking. Director Cook replied there would be different kinds of amendments based upon what type they are: revision, new, required and optional. Commissioner Quitslund said he was looking forward to the process and working with staff. Commissioner Gale mentioned she attended the library class about the geology of the island and said it was very enlightening. She felt it might be worth asking Mr. Hallett to come in and speak about the aquifers detailing the differences of perched and deep aquifers. Director Cook stated there was going to be a water workshop with different presenters some being from USGS. The proposed date was in June and there would be more information in the future.

ORDINANCE 2015-10 TENT CITY REGULATIONS - Study Session

Director Cook reminded the Commissioners that this ordinance is a requirement of our insurance provider (WCIA) as the result of an audit the City went through last year. She also stated the ordinance was written by the City Attorney and Special Project Planner Sutton provided an overview. She mentioned it was written broadly to encompass more than one temporary use, which would be helpful for situations like temporary parking, camps, etc. She reiterated there has not been a call from anyone requesting a tent city.

Commissioner Pearl was uncertain that all temporary uses should be lumped together because the uses can be so different. Commissioner Gale stated the way the chapter heading was written, it seemed to be about other uses as well. Planner Sutton stated the City Attorney will be re-writing it with the tent city portion occurring as a sub-topic. Commissioner Kriegh asked why any community group can apply for this permit when the State only requires the ordinance be required for churches. Commissioner Gale agreed and there was discussion about whether it needed to be more specific to ONLY religious organizations. Commissioner Pearl asked if all churches operate under conditional use permits. There was discussion of whether there needed to be a site plan review. Director Cook did not think there would be a site plan review under the temporary use permit process, but stated she would double check on that. After further discussion, she said City Attorney Marshall would need to be consulted as to where and how much the standards can be changed and which standards are set by the State.

Commissioner Kriegh asked if there was a guideline giving a ratio of property size to number of people that can be accommodated. Planner Sutton referred to new Section 18.15.050.2.

Planner Sutton asked the Commissioners whether 3 months would be the right length for a tent city to be allowed on a property. Commissioner Pearl thought it should be the minimum length of time required by the State. Commissioner Quitslund mentioned page 6, paragraph 3 – no comment period. He felt that was reasonable, but Commissioner Kriegh wondered why there was not a comment period and was that something that could be changed. Director Cook said they would ask Ms. Marshall. Commissioner Quitslund felt the sponsoring religious organization should bear more of the burden of putting information out to the public than the City. He stated the City should be kept out of any adversarial positions. Commissioner Pearl stated there had to be a public process and the City had the burden of that and it could not be written out of the ordinance. Commissioners Gale and Quitslund suggested there be a link on the City's website to direct the public to the hosting religious organization's website. Director Cook stated the information provided would be the same as it would be for any permit application. She also stated they could go back to State requirements to see if they can require more notice than 14 days.

Commissioner Kriegh asked if this was for any church, anywhere despite zoning, school location, etc. Director Cook stated she would check on that.

Robert Dashiell, Citizen – He noted when he read the proposed ordinance that it excluded anyone under age 18 in the homeless camps. Just as point of reference, there are individuals living in homeless camps in Seattle with children and Island Wood sponsors camp every year for the children of homeless people in Seattle, so the question is a legal one and whether you can actually exclude somebody with a family where

the children are under 18. Commissioner Kriegh felt that was a good question. Commissioner Pearl stated he assumed the City Attorney thought the City should, but he did not know and that the tent city seemed most important for homeless families. Commissioner Kriegh brought up the City of Portland's tiny houses for homeless people. Planner Sutton mentioned that Olympia also has a tiny house village that has been created for transitional housing for homeless people.

ORDINANCE 2015-04 LANDSCAPING AND TREE PROTECTION - Study Session

Planner Sutton provided an overview of the work performed since the last Planning Commission Study Session. The work thus far has centered on general standards and specifically on the Mixed Use/Town Center High School Road districts. She stated this ordinance does not complete the work of the Tree Ad Hoc Committee. She highlighted the changes recommended including increasing the bonus from 1.5 to 2.0 credits for saving a Heritage Tree. Commissioner Pearl explained the Committee's rationale for changing parking lot tree counts. Planner Sutton highlighted the future schedule of review for the Tree Ad Hoc Committee.

Commissioner Gale mentioned she thought the penalties were still too low for those who did not save trees. Planner Sutton re-read the code applying to the removal of trees explaining the fines listed were minimums. She went on to explain that the setting context of the tree affects its value and thus a value cannot be set in the City's code. Commissioner Kriegh brought up the timeframe of 5 years as a determining factor of whether a tree will live or not when it had been suggested by Olaf Ribeiro that it takes 5-10 years to know if a tree will be lost. She wanted to know where they could put something like that and Commissioner Pearl agreed but wanted to make sure the trees that would be included would have their valuation on the site plan as a reminder to the contractor to protect the tree.

Commissioner Pearl felt like this ordinance covered most situations; the only thing he wanted to add was valuing the trees beforehand instead of after the fact. He wondered where the resistance to this idea was coming from because there seemed to be resistance coming from somewhere. Commissioner Gale asked why it could not be added under Section 18.15.010.G.3(b). Planner Sutton thought it was more appropriate in the Administrative Code but agreed to put it in this section as well. Discussion continued with conifers in the buffers and partial screening along with percentage of native vegetation which would all be seen at a later time. Commissioner Pearl asked about the square footage of buffer areas greater than 400 square feet to protect a tree, stand of trees or future planting areas and whether that was putting too great a burden on the developer.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – What you did at the meeting was bring up the fact that even though it makes sense not to survey trees taken down, still you should get a count of those trees. Commissioner Pearl agreed. He asked if that was still in the ordinance. Commissioner Gale confirmed the ordinance did say that. Mr. Schmid felt it was important to count the trees to know how much canopy is lost. At the top of page four when you talk about the triple times value of the trees it sounds great but then the director may elect not to seek penalties if he or she determined the circumstances do not warrant imposition of civil penalties in addition to restitution. He asked the question: Is it difficult to have civil penalties? He noticed some City reluctance on giving fines and he would like to ask about civil penalties. He also asked about full screening and whether it was supposed to go around the whole perimeter of the parcel. Commissioner Pearl asked for clarification on the context. Mr. Schmid continued by pointing out Section 18.15.010.D.4(a). "The number of trees is determined by dividing the length of the landscape perimeter by 10 feet." There was discussion about what constituted the perimeter in question and whether the standard applied to the perimeter of the buffer or the lot itself. He also asked about Section 18.15.010.D.4(a) and the maximum 70% of evergreen trees but it does not say the spacing. His concern was that they might take 90% of the trees and put them all down in one corner because it does not say what the minimum spacing should be. Commissioner Kriegh felt it could say evenly distributed to provide a full screen. Mr. Schmid felt there should be a distance provided for the larger evergreens as well as the smaller ones. Commissioner Pearl mentioned this was a section of

the code the Tree Ad Hoc Committee had not yet studied. Mr. Schmid also had mixed feelings about tall trees that have dropped their limbs stating the sun still gets there. People plant smaller evergreens in between and they do pretty well so he could not see taking down the taller trees to put sunshine on smaller trees or not planting smaller trees because evergreens stay green all year round unlike the deciduous trees that die back during the winter. He stated he would come back when the committee addressed those issues.

Robert Dashiell, Citizen – One thing that concerned him was the tree value of retained trees. Can the assessor then consider that an additional value of the property or are trees excluded from assessor evaluation? If we value the trees and you have an open public record of increased value on that property, knowing how the government wants to go after new taxes, he was concerned on whether the public record would then increase property values. Can the Assessor use that extra value to increase the value of the property thereby increasing property taxes? He guessed that was not possible, but would like the legal answer to that. He felt someone should make sure we would not be getting into a higher property value situation if the trees were valued. Commissioner Quitslund stated that would be a good question for the Assessor. He stated he saw very few changes in the value of the land distinct from the house. Mr. Dashiell agreed and stated there may be a rule against it, but did not know whether there was and felt someone should look into that possibility because he was concerned about there being a public record of the value of the trees on his property. Commissioner Gale stated he could check with Seattle because they actually put a sign wrapped around the tree of its value. Planner Sutton stated she would check on it. Commissioner Kriegh wanted to there could be a tax break for owning a Heritage Tree.

Mr. Dashiell was also concerned about the 400 square foot undisturbed area during development. He stated that 91% of the water was supposed to be retained onsite which meant you would have to put augmented soil over most of the property. He felt it was perhaps not reasonable to require protection of that much space. He also mentioned that when he worked on an ordinance for the City he always liked to use hypothetical situations. The hypothetical situation he was using on the tree ordinance was what if the new police station was built in the same location of the current police station on the .89 acres. There would need to be 35.6 trees according to the proposed ordinance, not counting the parking lot trees. He wondered if that could even be done. He cautioned the Planning Commission to think about that when they discuss the density because that was a possible real-life situation the City may be facing in the coming months and he was not sure that would fit in there. Planner Sutton stated the process would start with the number of tree units currently on the property, take into account zoning and progress from there.

Motion: I move that we place this ordinance for public hearing on the May 28 meeting.
Gale/Quitslund: Motion passed 4-0

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

Commissioner Gale brought up the ADU discussion the City of Seattle is currently undergoing. She felt it was very interesting and informative and specifically mentioned the City of Portland's presentation.

ADJOURN

Meeting was adjourned at 8:53 PM

Minutes accepted by:

J. Mack Pearl, Chair

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist



**CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
REGULAR PLANNING COMMISSION MEETING
THURSDAY, MAY 14, 2015
6:00 p.m.-9:00 p.m.
CITY COUNCIL CHAMBER
280 MADISON AVE N
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WASHINGTON**

CALL TO ORDER - Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on Off-agenda Items
PLEASANT BEACH RESORT (PLN13880D SPR) - SITE PLAN & DESIGN REVIEW - Recommendation
ORDINANCE 2015-10, TENT CITY REGULATIONS - Study Session
2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Discuss Land Use Element Workshop Comments
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

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

Meeting was called to order by Commission Chair J. Mack Pearl at 6:06 PM. Commissioners present were Maradel Gale, Michael Lewars, Jon Quitslund and William Chester. Commissioner Julie Kriegh arrived at 7:20 PM while Commissioner John Thomas was absent and excused. City Staff in attendance were Planning Director Kathy Cook, Special Project Planner Jennifer Sutton, Planning Manager Joshua Machen, City Attorney Lisa Marshall and City Consultant Joe Tovar. Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely monitored recording and prepared minutes.

There were not any conflict disclosures.

PUBLIC COMMENT - Accept Public Comment on Off-agenda Items

None.

**PLEASANT BEACH RESORT (PLN13880D SPR) - SITE PLAN & DESIGN REVIEW -
Recommendation**

Planning Manager Joshua Machen introduced the project highlighting that the project has been around for 8 years in total describing this piece of the project as the “donut hole” of the overall property that has been under development. The 15 unit Inn will be made up of one main building as well as several cottage units in a mixed development zoning area. The project passed the Design Review Board unanimously.

Charles Wenzlau, Architect – Provided background information and presented site plans and photos of what the site currently looked like. He spoke about parking for the Inn which required 15 parking spaces, two in front of the manor house and 15 on Pitts Path, which was directly adjacent to the Inn. He also detailed the number of parking spots available in other areas of the resort overall. Commissioner Lewars asked what the bottom line number of parking spots was. Mr. Wenzlau stated they have 9-10 extra, unassigned parking spots in the overall resort property. He also spoke about the grading of Pitt’s Path being

too great for ADA requirements. The cottage area was described as a sort of bungalow courtyard. There is close access to the resort pool and open space area. Commissioner Pearl asked about the landscape buffer and how tall it would be since it abuts the open space. Discussion continued about whether the open space belonged to the development or was owned by someone else. It is owned by the Pleasant Beach Village developer and there are three wells belonging to South Bainbridge Water, so the likelihood of the open space being developed was very small. Conversation continued with a dialogue about the traffic study and the time of day/week the study was performed. Commissioner Gale was unhappy that the study did not take into account the weekend traffic at Lynwood Center but Commissioner Lewars felt the peak traffic for the week would be check-in on Fridays during rush hour traffic, so he did not have a problem with the traffic study.

Motion: I move that we recommend approval of this site plan and design review subject to the conditions laid out by staff in their memo to the Planning Commission.

Lewars/Quitslund: Passed 5-0

ORDINANCE 2015-10, TENT CITY REGULATIONS - Study Session

Planning Director Kathy Cook gave an overview of the work that had been done since the first study session on the Tent City Ordinance including City Attorney Lisa Marshall's answers to the Commissioners questions from the first study session being included in their agenda packets.

City Attorney Lisa Marshall gave an overview of the history of tent city ordinances citing the origin of tent city temporary permits in the Cities of Burien and Woodinville, Washington. She stated the Association of Washington Cities (the City's insurance carrier) requires the City to have an ordinance regulating the use of tent cities. Director Cook mentioned there would be a public hearing on the 28th of May with the Planning Commission making a recommendation to City Council after that. Discussion was begun by Commissioner Gale who asked about families with children since no one under the age of 18 is allowed in a homeless encampment hosted by an organization that already exists. Commissioner Pearl asked about whether the City had the power to limit where on the religious organization's property the encampment would be located. City Attorney Marshall said the City would have the ability to ask the organization to keep the encampment off critical areas. Commissioner Chester brought up the issue of setback and it was discussed whether a 25 foot setback would be better than a 20 foot one. The subject of different non-profit organizations securing permits that would allow back to back encampments in one location was spoken of and City Attorney Marshall agreed to look into providing language that would limit the ability to do that.

Motion: I move that we forward this to public hearing on May 28, 2015.

Gale/Quitslund: Passed 5-0

The Planning Commission took an 11 minute break at 7:06 PM.

2016 COMPREHENSIVE PLAN UPDATE - Discuss Land Use Element Workshop Comments

Planning Director Kathy Cook recapped the last study session on May 7, 2015 identifying two areas the Planning Commission asked City Staff to look into. Growth strategy (whether it should be modified in some manner) and Neighborhood Service Centers: 1) Policy that says you cannot expand the boundaries in any manner without doing a special planning area process; and 2) Which should come first, the sewer or the density plan. She asked the Commission if there were other topics they would like staff to focus on. Commissioner Pearl stated he would like to go through the list provided in the memorandum contained in the agenda packet.

Discussion began with the topic of Growth Strategy. Special Project Planner Sutton gave the Commission four strategies to think about:

- Keep 50%/5%/45% Strategy and enlarge Winslow Master Plan Study Area (WMPSA) to add units.
 - o Suzuki Property (13.83 acres) not in WMPSA.

- Keep WMPSA as is; increase residential density in Winslow residential zones.
 - o Change R-2.9 and R-3.5 Zones to r-4.3, resulting in infill spread over Winslow residential zones.
- Increase density at NSC areas, less in Winslow.
- Get rid of Growth Strategy altogether.

Approximately 71% of population growth from 2004 to 2014 occurred in the Winslow area. Commissioner Chester stated that if they decided the Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs) had to take more population growth the Commission would also have to expand/change zoning in the NSCs to allow for that growth. Consultant Joe Tovar spoke about all the aspects of increasing density at the NSCs and that there would not be time to make a decision about that between now and June 2016. He felt this was more of a subarea or special planning area topic and that it could be discussed later by adding a statement or plan saying the Commission would do so. Commissioner Lewars brought up that the Commission needed a starting place and he was concerned that during the last comprehensive plan update they overshot the number. Ms. Cook stated they had not done that, the growth just finally caught up with the predicted pattern. The process the Island Center NSC went through several years ago was discussed and the lack of neighborhood support noted. Commissioner Chester liked the idea of neighborhoods having input into how their area is developed.

The Commission asked for City Staff to come back with some scenarios based upon the four strategies Ms. Sutton presented.

Ron Peltier, Citizen – It almost seems like the land use element should have come after the Transportation, Water and Capital Facilities elements because all this stuff fits together. The Transportation element is really important because we are talking about an island that doesn't have a big square area where you can lay out a grids and roads and everything. We are increasing more and more down in the south end, where most of the traffic gets funneled around the head of the bay and through that one road, so what is that going to do to our level of service to our roads there and how much burden is that going to put on the City to upgrade and maintain that level of service. We have a schedule with the Land Use Element first and the other elements second, I would encourage the Commission to keep this bigger picture in mind because that should really help you decide if we want to change the growth strategy or not. All those things are very pertinent and I haven't heard you talking about those very much and I would encourage you to think about those other elements.

Commissioner Lewars said they spoke at great length in the Steering Committee about all of this and that they have to start somewhere. Commissioner Chester also said they were trying to start here and then when they have discussion on other elements, they will be able to go back to this one.

Charles Wenzlau, Citizen – Found the conversation fascinating and was pleased that a lot of the items the Commission was circling around were similar items that were put in their package a week ago. The only thing that was worrisome to him was the thought of expanding the Winslow boundary. He saw that as creep and he thought the boundary was essential to keeping quality innovation within Winslow, keeping it walkable and he personally thought there was still capacity for the small pocket in-fill projects that were the livable, successful part of Winslow's growth.

The Commission reiterated the desire to have staff bring some projected scenarios to the discussion, including possibilities for the Neighborhood Service Centers that have not had a plan done. Commissioner Gale wanted information on some of the up-zoning possibilities in the existing Winslow area and what that would accomplish. Commissioner Lewars asked for staff help with giving the NSCs a slightly higher allocation and what would they do to accomplish that. Special Planner Sutton asked for clarification on what exactly the Commission would like to see: density, size and boundaries assuming that sewer would happen.

The Commission asked for more information about the following topics:

- In-fill development on High School Road
- Neighborhood Service Centers
- Rural neighborhood communities (Temporary Moorage)
- Adopt a mandatory green building code
- Form based code (link to special planning areas)
- Promoting transit diversity (move to Transportation Element)
- Extending the housing design demonstration program island wide (Sustainable Bucket)
- Water conservation measures as a mandatory element (Sustainability Element)
- Designate aquifer resource recharge zones (Water Element)
- Sea water intrusion (Water Element)
- Growth Management Act update
- Metrics to determine development impact (Every Element)

Charles Wenzlau, Citizen – Spoke about the metrics. His group felt very strongly that it was something the City should have as a consideration in their policies. One was a goal setting exercise, i.e., green building code or water conservation, should a target be set in the future like a strategic plan where success can be measured. He felt that was really missing and he knew they could not be overly specific about it but sometimes goal setting is sometimes great for the community to see how the City is doing. Commissioner Kriegh agreed and felt the City needed a baseline, a target and then in a time period, track if the goal has been met.

- Site development on micro-scale
- LEED (Sustainability Element)
- Downtown residential/mixed use development
- Unlock Neighborhood Service Center box
- Finish Island SPA started in 2002
- Revitalize Neighborhood Service Centers
- Rolling Bay SPA
- Coppertop development zoning
- Resident planned neighborhoods
- Land “banks”
- Social cost of upzoning (Keep in mind in further discussions)

Commissioner Kriegh brought up the topic of parking as a private/public joint venture. She felt the Commission needed to think about how they would deal with parking capacity. Special Planner Sutton felt that when the Commission looked at what the neighborhood service centers should look like, parking would be a key issue. She continued by outlining the different ways to calculate how much parking is needed.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

Meeting was adjourned at 9:04 PM.

Minutes accepted by:

J. Mack Pearl, Chair

Jane Rasely, Recording Secretary

DRAFT



City of Bainbridge Island
PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT

MEMORANDUM

TO: Planning Commission

FROM: Jennifer Sutton, AICP
Special Project Planner

DATE: June 25, 2015

RE: Study Session on Comprehensive Plan Update: Introduction & Land Use Element

At the June 11th Study Session, the Planning Commission reviewed proposed updates to the *Introduction* and *Land Use Element* of the Comprehensive Plan (Plan). The Planning Commission made several recommendations to staff that are summarized below.

INTRODUCTION TO COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

During the June 11th meeting, the Commission continued their discussion of the *Introduction*, with the bulk of the discussion again focused on the merits of transforming and adding to the Plan's current 5 *Overriding Principles* that appear at the beginning of the *Introduction* and the beginning of the *Land Use Element* in the current Plan. The Commission recommended to continue calling these overall goals *Principles*, and not change them to *Framework Goals*. The Commission recommended other additions and organizational changes to the *Introduction*, including moving much of the background information to appendices. The Commission's drafting subcommittee (Commissioners Gale and Quitslund) reviewed the recommended changes at their June 16th meeting, and the result is the draft *Introduction* in this packet. The memorandum by planning consultant Joe Tovar further discusses the recommended changes to the *Introduction*.

Planning Commission Action: Review and make recommendations on changes to the *Introduction* chapter of the Plan, completing review of the *Introduction* at this time. All proposed changes to the Plan would be brought back before the Commission at a future public hearing.

LAND USE ELEMENT

I. Housekeeping – Clarifying - Update Changes

The copy of the *Land Use Element* provided to the Commission for the June 11th meeting was color coded to show housekeeping changes to update the Plan- the color-coding indicated:

- Yellow: Needs Updating
- Red: Deletion
- Green: Addition
- Grey: To Appendix
- Blue: To Temporary Moorage

The Commission affirmed the housekeeping/ clarifying changes delineated in the June 11th version of the *Land Use Element*, and recommended that those changes be integrated into the draft of the *Land Use Element*. The housekeeping color-coding has been removed from the draft *Element*, with changes now shown in strikethrough/ underline. The drafting subcommittee confirmed those updates at their meeting. The drafting subcommittee also discussed the instances of using SHALL vs SHOULD, or rewriting the sentence to be in the active tense, and made recommendations. Their recommendations are integrated draft of the *Land Use Element* shaded in grey. Text is highlighted in black to show where staff is seeking policy direction from the Planning Commission (see discussion below).

Planning Commission Action: Review and confirm recommendations on the housekeeping and SHALL/SHOULD changes to the Land Use Element.

II. Recommendation to Change the 2004 Plan Residential Growth Strategy

On June 11th the Planning Commission recommended eliminating the numeric aspect of the current growth strategy (i.e., directing 50% of new Island-wide growth to Winslow, 5% to the Neighborhood Service Centers, 45% on the balance of the Island). This recommendation acknowledges that Winslow has absorbed much of the residential growth over the last twenty years, and therefore only has about 23% of total residential capacity under existing zoning densities.

Instead of the numeric strategy, the City should ensure current policies and land use designations focus residential growth where urban services such as sewer, water, and transportation facilities are located. This promotion of infill goes hand-in-hand with a more proactive and holistic conservation strategy. The draft of the *Land Use Element* prepared for the June 25th meeting integrates this recommendation on the residential growth strategy.

III. Commission Policy Direction Required

The table below should be used by the Commission to review and provide direction to staff on the outstanding policy questions in the *Land Use Element*. The table refers to places where “PC Policy direction” is noted in white/black text shown on the proposed amended Land Use Element. The Commission began review of these policy questions, finishing with Issue #3.

Planning Commission Action: Discuss and make recommendations on outstanding policy questions outlined in table below. The issues of expansion of Neighborhood Service Centers and the City’s current Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) policies reflect complex policy questions, and Staff requests that the Commission ensure that those two topics are discussed on June 25th. A 2006 report analyzing the City’s current TDR program is helpful for this discussion, and can be viewed online- [Navigate Bainbridge- Reference Document Library](#). The Commission can request hard copies of any of the documents or reports from staff.

Issue #	Approve policy or draft new text?	Yes	No
1	Replace “shalls” with “shoulds” throughout the Land Use Element? NOTE: The Commission drafting subcommittee reviewed and made recommendations on the SHALL vs SHOULD at their 6/16 meeting- recommended text is highlighted with grey in the draft LU Element		

Issue #	Approve policy or draft new text?	Yes	No
2	Should the plan affirm Island-wide Land Use Strategy of 50% Winslow/5% NSCs and 45% elsewhere?		X
3	Should the plan replace the existing Island-wide Land Use Strategy with a strategy of “adopt a conservation plan/concentrate new growth in centers with services”?	X	
4	Should the Plan keep text re: Neighborhood Services Centers only able to be expanded through the subarea planning process-see pages 2, 3, 23 and 24? Should the City “Unlock the box” that currently requires a Special Planning Area (SPA) process for any new NSC zoning. Either commit to the SPA process for the Island Center and Rolling Bay NSCs, <u>or</u> revise the current Plan policy to allow for some incremental expansion. PLANNING COMMISSION AGREED AT MAY 7th WORKSHOP THAT THIS IS A PRIORITY.		
5	Should the Plan keep/revise existing Transfer of Development Rights language in the Plan? See pages 4, 12, and 29.		
6	Should the Plan keep existing text regarding Business Industrial Districts? See page 26.		
7	Should the Plan keep existing Policy regarding development of 40 acres of city-owned land on Vincent road? See Page 30.		
8	Should the Plan keep Fort Ward Goal? See page 31.		
Issues 9 through 28 were first reported in a May 28, 2015 memo from Kathy Cook to the PC. On many of these, the PC gave preliminary direction, which is noted IN BOLD.			
9	Consider increasing density and number of units through infill and compact development. Create “urban villages” in the High School Road zones, with mixed use development and design requirements emphasizing walkability and a sense of community, while avoiding the current strip-mall appearance. Floor area ratio (FAR) levels could be increased in this area to take some of the pressure away from the Core District; the increased density would be offset by pedestrian-oriented, attractive design. RETAIN AND CONSIDER FURTHER.		
10	Create “rural neighborhood communities” in the lower density residential zones, with clustered, smaller homes and 50% of the land area preserved as open space through a conservation easement. CONSIDER FURTHER.		
11	Adopt a mandatory green building code. INCLUDE A POLICY DIRECTIVE IN THE PLAN AS PART OF A LARGER SUSTAINABILITY SECTION/ELEMENT.		
12	Look at examples of what other communities have done with form-based codes. CONSIDER INCLUDING A POLICY DIRECTIVE AS PART OF THE REVIEW OF NEIGHBORHOOD SERVICE CENTERS/SPECIAL PLANNING AREA DISCUSSION.		
13	Extend the Housing Design Demonstration Program (HDDP) island-wide. DEFER TO A FUTURE “BUCKET” or TEMPORARY MOORAGE.		

Issue #	Approve policy or draft new text?	Yes	No
14	Include water conservation measures as a mandatory element in new development. INCLUDE A POLICY DIRECTIVE IN THE PLAN AS PART OF A LARGER SUSTAINABILITY SECTION/ELEMENT AND ADDRESS IN REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT AND CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE.		
15	Designate aquifer recharge conservation zones and make the management of water resources a top priority. INCLUDE A POLICY DIRECTIVE IN THE PLAN AS PART OF A LARGER SUSTAINABILITY SECTION/ELEMENT AND ADDRESS IN REVIEW OF ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT AND CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE.		
16	Sea water intrusion should be a top priority in the update process. INCLUDE A POLICY DIRECTIVE IN THE PLAN AS PART OF A LARGER SUSTAINABILITY SECTION/ELEMENT AND ADDRESS IN REVIEW OF WATER RESOURCES AND ENVIRONMENTAL ELEMENT AND CRITICAL AREAS ORDINANCE.		
18	Metrics are needed to determine the impacts of development including the HDDP. CONSIDER ADDING POLICY ABOUT ESTABLISHING TARGETS AND MEASURING SUCCESS, BUT METRICS THEMSELVES SHOULD NOT BE IN COMP PLAN.		
19	We need to look at site development on a “micro-scale.” Vegetation management needs to be addressed in greater detail, including tree protection during construction. We should be addressing biodiversity, groundwater recharge, removal of invasive species and stormwater management. ACHIEVE THROUGH DEVELOPMENT REGULATIONS.		
20	Look at LEED Neighborhood Development and Green Factor programs in developing land use goals and policies. INCLUDE A POLICY DIRECTIVE IN THE PLAN AS PART OF A LARGER SUSTAINABILITY SECTION/ELEMENT.		
21	Identify areas in the downtown AREA where residential/mixed use development is desirable, and then adjust FARs so that purely commercial development is not possible. GIVE FURTHER CONSIDERATION.		
22	Finish the Island Center SPA the City started in 2002. NSC DISCUSSION.		
23	Revitalize Neighborhood Service Centers (NSCs), possibly using package waste treatment systems as an alternative to sewers. NSC DISCUSSION.		
24	The Rolling Bay SPA should be done concurrently with the Comprehensive Plan Update process. PART OF NSC DISCUSSION		
25	The Coppertop development has such a diversity of uses and services that it no longer matches Business/Industrial (B/I) goals and policies in the Comp Plan. It looks and functions more like a Neighborhood Service Center or some other type of commercial center. The zoning of this property should be looked at during the update process, as well as the B/I goals and policies. RETAIN AND CONSIDER FURTHER		

Issue #	Approve policy or draft new text?	Yes	No
26	Look at what other cities do in terms of neighborhood planning processes—every neighborhood has a plan developed by its residents.		
27	Look into “land banks,” where a developer pays to develop and the resultant funds are used to buy open space.		
28	Any upzoning has a social cost and needs to be offset by decreased density elsewhere or some type of public benefit. SHOULD BE UNDERLYING THEME THROUGHOUT REVIEW PROCESS.		
29	Add Food Policy, Planning and Security policies to the Land Use Element, perhaps adding to existing Agriculture policies.		

Please also note review of the Land Use Element will not be limited to these issues—the public may continue to submit ideas through June 30th and the Planning Commission may also wish to add topics for review. For instance, new policies related to “Food Policy” or “Agriculture” will be discussed in the future, including consideration of whether a new Food and Agriculture Element should be created.

Next Steps

At the July 9th Planning Commission meeting, staff will bring back the next draft of the *Land Use Element* integrated with changes recommended by the Commission at tonight’s meeting. The City’s window for submission of Comprehensive Plan Amendments ends on June 30th and any Amendments submitted will be brought to the July 9th Planning Commission meeting for review.

Commissioner Quitslund has suggested combining substantial discussion of Business/Industrial (B/I) policies in the *Land Use Element* with B/I policies in the *Economic Element*. Staff is planning on holding the *Economic Element* workshop in mid-late July, and Commission review to begin in early August. Staff would like the full Commission to confirm that approach.



Memorandum

TO: Bainbridge Island Planning Commission

FROM: Joseph W. Tovar, FAICP

DATE: June 25, 2015

SUBJ: Revised Comp Plan Introduction

At your June 11, 2015 meeting, the Planning Commission heard comments from several citizens regarding the first draft of proposed amendments to the Comp Plan Introduction and deliberated on the matter. The attached Revised Comp Plan Introduction, with the date 6 25 15 in the footer, was written to incorporate your conclusions and direction. This text was prepared by me and the staff with oversight and suggested edits by the Planning Commission drafting committee.

This draft uses the convention of ~~striketrough~~ to show deletions and underlining to show additional text relative to the 2004 Plan. Many of these striketroughs and underlinings were in the draft you reviewed on June 11. Where we have added or deleted text pursuant to your direction, we have used yellow highlighting. Following is a summary by page of these changes with rationale.

Page 1

As Commissioner Quitslund said at the June 11 meeting, the text for Section I, "Bainbridge Island 2015" is really dated and not really appropriate as an introductory "profile" of Bainbridge Island today. We have referred the entire "historic" section, including this ~~striketrough~~ text, to the Bainbridge Historic Commission for updating. When we get it back, we will share it with you with the recommendation that it be placed in an appendix to the Plan. We will compose a brief "Profile" section to describe "Bainbridge Island Today" and bring that to a meeting for your review.

Page 2

Section II on "What is a Comprehensive Plan and how is it used" has a number of changes. The drafting committee proposes replacing "etc." with "and following" at the end of the first paragraph. We have added a letter at the beginning of the headers to provide better orientation for the readers. Paragraph "A" replaces the prior legalistic words "pursuant to the GMA" with "as defined by the GMA."

Same page, we replaced a "which" with a "that."

Page 3

The Planning Commission wanted to remove any specific reference to “Priority Based Budgeting” and instead refer to the City’s budget process. That is reflected in the text in the first paragraph on this page.

Section B about “How is the Comprehensive Plan used?” has been edited to reflect the Planning Commission’s decision not to rename the Principles as Framework Goals.

Section C “Types and degrees of policy direction” was drafted to explain the meaning and use of the terms Goals and Policies in the Elements of the Comprehensive Plan. It also explains to the reader how Goals are served by Policies and how both provide direction to various implementing actions. This section also explains how the use of active verbs may be used to convey different degrees of directiveness (e.g., “maintain” is more directive than “encourage”). Similarly, the point is made that auxiliary verbs (e.g., “shall” vs. “should”) can similarly convey different degrees of direction.

Page 4

Section D “How and when may the Comprehensive Plan be amended?” was added after the drafting committee met on Tuesday. It is the only section that they did not see and specifically recommend for the full Commission’s consideration on June 25. I added this section after learning that the Department of Commerce, who will be reviewing the Plan, strongly advise that such language be included. I have paraphrased in more user-friendly language the substance of what the GMA says about amendments. I have included the statutory citation to RCW 36.70A.130 for those who may wish to check for themselves what the specific statutory requirements are.

Section III, Vision, Guiding Principles and Policies starts on page 4 and continues through page 9. The paragraph on this page notes that we are keeping the word “principles” rather than goals, and have expanded them from five to seven. Per the Commission’s direction, this text also makes reference to the City’s “biennial budgeting process” rather than the Priority Based Budgeting language from the earlier draft.

Page 5

The Vision language was untouched from the version you saw on June 11. The text at the bottom of this page, and on subsequent pages, retains the term “Principle” rather than “Goal.” Per the Commission’s direction, we have added the phrase “small town atmosphere of downtown Winslow” as part of the “special character of the Island” and the term “scenic” to describe many of the roads on the Island, both those that are winding and those that are not.

Page 6

We have re-named the previous “Framework Policies” as “Guiding Policies” to reflect the Commission’s decision not to use the term “Framework.” On Guiding Policy 1.3 the drafting committee concluded that the term “development” was more appropriate than “growth” because much of what will be occurring on the Island in the future may be re-development rather than new growth.

Page 7

Recall that at your June 11 meeting, the Commission concluded that expanding the idea of sustainability apply to people and the Island economy had merit, but that it resulted in awkward wording to simply insert “economy” and “human resources” into Principle #5. That is why we have basically retained Principle #5 as it was originally with a focus on environmental sustainability.

In order to capture the broader and more inclusive meaning of “sustainability,” we drafted Principle #6 and Guiding Policies 6.1, 6.2 and 6.3. Endnote #15 explains the source of the language of Principle #6 as the common definition of “Sustainability.”

The drafting committee felt that this new Principle and Guiding Policies provided a better connection to the social equity and economic opportunities pillars of the “sustainability concept.”

Page 8

Principle #7 has been revised to reflect the Commission’s desire to refer to the City’s “organizational and operating budget decisions” rather than the specific terminology “priority based budgeting.”

Attachment #1 - Revised Comp Plan Introduction

Introduction – Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan

I. Bainbridge Island 2015 ~~The Island Today~~

~~The Island's once rural landscape began yielding to residential pressures as events such as the 1962 Seattle World's Fair led to the Island's continued "discovery." In some areas, summer cabins became year-round residences and berry farms became golf courses surrounded by cul-de-sacs. The Island has three privately owned courses. Two courses are the region's oldest — Country Club and Wing Point.~~

~~An Island-wide park district was formed in 1965, transforming former military lands and preserving other lands for recreational purposes, including a swimming pool. The State Parks acquired the Fay property near Port Monroe and waterfront portions of Fort Ward. Today, the fort is a National Historic District, one of at least ten historic areas and part of the 200 properties on the State's Island historic resource inventory. Archaeological sites also remain and are protected by state law.~~

~~Today, the skyline is lower — forests have been logged two or even three times. Islanders voted in _____ to purchase Grand Forest from the state. Few salmon return to spawn in local streams and paralytic, shellfish poisoning toxins are now recorded periodically within the Sound. Since 1970, commercial divers have harvested geoducks from newly discovered deep-water beds. The largest industry is aquaculture. Disease resistant Atlantic salmon are raised by Norwegian specialists in floating pens off Fort Ward.~~

~~Environmental concerns led to the closure of the Island's oldest industry, the creosote wood preservative plant. New, land-based industrial efforts produce such items as commercial fish net systems, sport fishing poles, office furniture, and housing. Farm pursuits focus mainly on wine grapes, berries, produce, and livestock. A seasonal, weekly Farmers' Market offers home-grown produce. The school district is the largest employer, but many Islanders commute to King, and Kitsap County urban centers. Far from being isolated, Islanders play an active role in the regional and world community and value cultural diversity.~~

~~Population growth pressures, environmental concerns, and county representation were among the issues that caused residents to study ways of gaining more access to government and more local control. In 1991, Islanders elected to annex all other areas to Winslow and to change the name of their new city to Bainbridge Island. A more complete discussion of the Island's history and evolution is contained in Appendix X.~~

~~The forces of change, including this Plan, will continue to shape the Island.~~

II. What is the Comprehensive Plan and how is it used?

The authority and requirements for the City of Bainbridge Island to adopt and update its Comprehensive Plan (the **Plan**) is contained in the Growth Management Act (GMA) (RCW 36.70A) [NOTE: insert hyperlink here]. The GMA requires that the plan be reviewed and updated at least every eight years, which means that the periodic update cycle for Bainbridge Island is 2016, 2024, 2032, and following.

The GMA requires that the Plan have sufficient land capacity and urban services adequate to accommodate at least the next twenty years of growth, although the City may choose to adopt policies and strategies with an even longer time-frame. For example, sustainability goals, policies or strategies may have a multi-decade or even multi-generational perspective.

A. What a Comprehensive Plan is and isn't, as defined by the GMA

The GMA definition of a Plan is:

"Comprehensive land use plan," "comprehensive plan," or "plan" means a generalized coordinated land use policy statement of the governing body of a county or city that is adopted pursuant to this chapter."¹

Thus, the Bainbridge Island Comprehensive Plan is a "policy statement" that provides important direction to a variety of city actions, including, but not limited to, the adoption of its capital budget and its development regulations. However, the Plan is not a "land use control" which means that it is not designed or intended to be applied directly to development permits.

The GMA definition of development regulations is:

"Development regulations" or "regulation" means the controls placed on development or land use activities by a . . . city, including, but not limited to, zoning ordinances, critical areas ordinances, shoreline master programs, official controls, planned unit development ordinances, subdivision ordinances, and binding site plan ordinances together with any amendments thereto . . ."²

The GMA also states:

"Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its comprehensive plan."³

The "shall perform its activities" phrase suggests broader application of comprehensive plan policies than simply codes and capital budgets. On Bainbridge Island, the City maintains a number of functional plans, such as the City's utilities plans as well as

programs it funds and administers through its biennial budget. The City also coordinates with other units of local government, e.g., the Bainbridge Island School, Fire, and Parks districts, each of which maintains its own programs and functional or operational plans.

B. How is the Comprehensive Plan used?

The Vision, Guiding Principles and Policies in this section of the Comprehensive Plan provide substantive direction to all of the Plan Elements as well as the City's budget and work program priorities. They also provide direction to the City's functional plans such as its parks, stormwater and utilities plans.

In addition, the Vision, Guiding Principles and Policies communicate the City's priorities to the other units of government responsible for providing services to the Island community. This includes the Bainbridge Island Fire, Park and School Districts, and the Washington State Department of Transportation, all of which prepare functional and operating plans to provide their respective services and facilities to Island residents.

C. Types and degrees of policy direction

The Elements in this Comprehensive Plan consist of Goals and Policies. Goals express the high-rank order values that are most important to the Island community. They are aspirational, frequently describing desired outcomes. The Policies listed under each Goal identify strategies or specific actions to be taken to move the community in the direction of fulfilling the Goal.

Depending on the issue and the Element, the Goals and Policies may provide direction to the City Council, the Planning Commission, the Hearing Examiner and City staff. Some of the actions will take the form of land use or other regulations; others will be capital projects or programs; and still others may take the form of outreach, education, coordination or partnership with citizens, organizations or other units of government.

The goal and policy statements sometimes use very directive verbs, such as "maintain" or "adopt". In other cases, less directive verbs are used, such as "consider" or "encourage." The more directive verbs convey a higher rank order of policy direction. Directive goal or policy language may call for the updating of development regulations, however, that does not convert them into controls or conditions that can be directly applied to a permit decision.⁴

A similar distinction can be made between the auxiliary verbs "should" and "shall." Both terms are used in the Comprehensive Plan and it is intended that both provide substantive direction. The difference in meaning between "should" and "shall" is one of degree rather than kind. As used in this Plan, the word "shall" imparts a higher order of substantive direction than the word "should." However, as with the active verbs, the use of "shall" remains substantive policy direction, not a land use control within the GMA meaning and definitions cited above.

D. How and when may the Comprehensive Plan be amended?

In addition to the eight year cycle for the periodic review of the Comprehensive Plan, the GMA also includes requirements regarding potential plan amendments in the intervening years. Set forth at RCW 36.70A.130, these include:

- A comprehensive plan may be amended only once in any given calendar year.
- All proposed plan amendments, including those initiated by private parties or by the City, should be considered concurrently to determine the cumulative effect of the proposals.
- Procedures must be adopted for any interested person to suggest amendments to either the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations.
- A city must establish a means by which it will “docket” (i.e., compile and maintain a list) of all suggested plan or development regulation amendments and consider whether or not to adopt them during the amendment process.
- Public participation programs must be developed and followed for proposed amendments or revisions to the Comprehensive Plan or development regulations.
- Exceptions to the once-a-year limitation on plan amendments include: the initial adoption of a subarea plan; the adoption or amendment of a Shoreline Master Program; the amendment of the capital facilities element that occurs concurrently with the adoption of the city budget; when the city is under a remand order from either the Growth Hearings Board of a court; and when the City declares an emergency.

III. Vision, Guiding Principles and Policies

This section contains the Island’s Vision, an aspirational description of the community’s desired future. The values and priorities in the Vision are served and advanced through this comprehensive plan and its implementing actions. This section also contains seven guiding principles that connect the Vision to the elements of the Comprehensive Plan. These seven principles affirm, clarify and update the five principles in the 2004 version of the Comprehensive Plan and also direct that decisions made through the City’s biennial budgeting process support the adopted Vision, guiding principles and policies.

A. Vision

Bainbridge Island is notable for its beauty, its maritime climate, its location between Seattle and the Olympic Peninsula, and its support of the arts. The island consists of beaches and harbors, forests and fields, trails and two-lane country roads, homes and businesses surrounded by the waters of Puget Sound. We are defined as much by the water around us as by the ground beneath our feet.

Bainbridge has a rich natural and cultural history including a long presence of indigenous people, followed more recently by European and Asian immigrants who built timber, maritime and agricultural economies. Contemporary Bainbridge Island is home to a diverse mix of people including farmers, artists, students, business professionals, retirees, and is hospitable to visitors.

The people of Bainbridge aspire to accommodate inevitable growth while protecting the wildlife habitat, watersheds, shorelines, open space, and the air and water quality of the island. We welcome innovative ideas, industrious business people, new and traditional cultures, and people of all ages and backgrounds. We strive to provide quality housing, education, health care, and business, recreational, and cultural opportunities for all of our inhabitants. We embrace local food sources, renewable energy, and paths for biking and walking.

Global warming and the impacts of climate change are major issues for our generation, and will be for the foreseeable future. We recognize that it will be challenging to adapt to the environmental and economic changes that we will face in the decades ahead. The good will, imagination, and pragmatism of our citizens will foster a compassionate environment in which we listen to, learn from, and engage with all the people who live here. There is no word for exclusion in the Lushootseed language of Puget Sound.

The people of Bainbridge Island understand that it will take an active approach to not only maintain, but restore and enhance the condition of the island if we expect to continue enjoying its bounty. Island residents balance personal interests with concern for the community and the environment. As the island's population increases, we will manage our lands and waters thoughtfully, with innovative planning policies.

Bainbridge citizens embrace the challenges of our future. That future calls on residents and visitors alike to actively participate in shaping a joyful, stable, and sustainable community, where its present and future generations are stewards of the land and keepers of its culture.

B. FIVE OVERRIDING PRINCIPLES THAT GUIDE THE PLAN

Principle #1 - Preserve the special character of the Island, which includes the small town atmosphere of downtown Winslow, forested areas, meadows, farms, marine views, scenic and winding roads bordered by dense vegetation that support all forms of transportation.

Guiding Policy 1.1

Adopt an island-wide conservation plan⁵ to identify and apply effective strategies to preserve the natural and scenic qualities that make the Island a special place.

Guiding Policy 1.2

Accommodate new growth in central places that meet the Island's identified needs for housing, services and jobs while respecting conservation and environmental protection priorities.

Guiding Policy 1.3

Identify appropriate land use patterns and building form alternatives to achieve the Island's priorities for both conservation and growth development.

Principle # 2 - Protect the water resources of the Island.

Guiding Policy 2.1

Manage water resources for Bainbridge Island for present and projected land uses, recognizing that Island water resources [aquifers] are the sole [source] of our water supply.⁶

Guiding Policy 2.2

Preserve and protect the functions and values of the Island's aquatic resources.⁷

Guiding Policy 2.3

Anticipate and prepare for the consequences of sea level rise.⁸

Guiding Policy 2.4

Maintain the Island's comprehensive program of water resource data gathering and analysis.⁹

Principle # 3 - Foster diversity and meet the human needs of the residents of the Island, its most precious resource.

Guiding Policy 3.1

Ensure a variety of housing choices to meet the needs of present and future residents in all economic segments and promote ~~by promoting~~ plans, projects and proposals to create a significant amount of affordable housing.¹⁰

Guiding Policy 3.2

Maintain the well being of all members of the Island community, where all

Islanders feel connected to the community and where each individual has opportunities to contribute to the community.¹¹

Guiding Policy 3.3

Support, protect, and enhance the value of the arts and humanities as essential to education, quality of life, economic vitality, broadening of mind and spirit, and as treasure in trust for our descendants.¹²

Principle # 4 - Consider the costs and benefits to Island residents and property owners should be considered in making land use decisions.

Guiding Policy 4.1

Respect private property rights protected by the State and U.S. Constitutions.

Guiding Policy 4.2

Recognize that private property rights are not absolute, but must be balanced with necessary and reasonable regulation to protect the public health, safety and welfare.

Principle # 5 – ~~Development should be based on the principle that the~~
Recognize that the Island’s environmental resources are finite and must be maintained at a sustainable level. the Island’s finite environmental resources.

Guiding Policy 5.1

Preserve and enhance the Island’s natural systems, natural beauty and environmental quality.¹³

Guiding Policy 5.2

Protect and enhance wildlife, fish resources and natural ecosystems on Bainbridge Island.¹⁴

Guiding Policy 5.3

Identify strategies and actions to mitigate and adapt to the effects of climate change.

Principle #6 Meet the needs of the present without compromising the ability of future generations to meet their own needs.¹⁵

Guiding Policy 6.1

Look beyond the state’s mandated 20-year plan horizon in order to recognize the longer term life cycles of natural systems, green building practices, and public infrastructure investments.

Guiding Policy 6.2

Advance social equity on the Island by addressing basic human needs, including affordable housing, personal health and safety, mobility, and access to

human services.

Guiding Policy 6.3

Seek appropriate ways to provide economic opportunities for all community residents within a diversified Island economy.

Principle #7 - Support the Island's Guiding Principles and Policies through the City's organizational and operating budget decisions.

Guiding Policy 7.1

Promote *good governance*¹⁶ and an Island culture of citizenship, stewardship and civic engagement.¹⁷

Guiding Policy 7.2

Update each City department's work program annually, allocate sufficient time and resources and provide needed policy direction to achieve consistency with and implement the Comprehensive Plan.¹⁸

Guiding Policy 7.3

Grow a diversified¹⁹ *vibrant economy*.²⁰

Guiding Policy 7.4

Nurture a *healthy and attractive community*.²¹

Guiding Policy 7.5

Build *reliable infrastructure and connected mobility*.²²

Guiding Policy 7.6

Grow a *green, well-planned community*.²³

Guiding Policy 7.7

Maintain a *safe city*.²⁴

¹ RCW 36.70A.030(4).

² RCW 36.70A.030(7).

³ RCW 36.70A.120.

⁴ **The Growth Management Hearings Board held in an early case:** "While there is an important directive linkage between them, policies (i.e., plans) and regulations are distinct GMA creatures. The Act's consistency requirements give plans directive effect over regulations, however this does not convert policy documents into land use controls." *Tulalip v. Snohomish County*, Growth Management Hearings Board Case No. 99-3-0013, 1/28/00, Final Decision and Order, at p. 4.

⁵ Final Report, City of Bainbridge Island Mayor's 2025 Growth Advisory Committee.

⁶ Plan, Water Resources Element, Goal 1.

⁷ Plan, Environmental Element Aquatic Resources Goal 1, which is also the mandate under the GMA to designate and protect the "functions and values" of ecosystems. RCW 36.70A.060 and .170.

⁸ Plan, Environment Element, Frequently flooded areas, Goal 1.

⁹ Plan, Water Resources Element.

¹⁰ Final Report, City of Bainbridge Island Mayor's 2025 Growth Advisory Committee.

¹¹ Plan, Human Services Element, Framework Statement.

¹² Plan, Cultural Element, Goal submitted for Inclusion.

¹³ Plan, Environment Element, Environment Goal 1.

¹⁴ Plan, Environment Element, Fish and Wildlife Goal 1.

¹⁵ This is the definition of sustainability most frequently used by American cities in plans, strategies, programs and budgets. It was published first in 1987 in a United Nations report titled “Our Common Future.” It is often referred to as the Bruntland Commission Report, after its Chair Gro Harlem Bruntland.

¹⁶ *Good Governance* is one of the six desired results of the City’s Council’s adopted budget priorities adopted in 2014.

¹⁷ *A culture of stewardship, citizenship and civic engagement* was one of the key issues to address listed in the City Council’s adopted scope for the Plan Update.

¹⁸ This proposed Guiding Policy expresses the City’s commitment to continually take actions to be included in its planning work program and the work programs of all city departments, to meet its statutory duties under the GMA to be consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan. RCW 36.70A.040(3) provides in part that “each city located within the county shall adopt a comprehensive plan under this chapter and development regulations that are consistent with and implement the comprehensive plan” RCW 36.70A.120 also states: “Each county and city that is required or chooses to plan under RCW 36.70A.040 shall perform its activities and make capital budget decisions in conformity with its comprehensive plan.”

¹⁹ Plan, Economic Element, Goal 1, uses the important term “diversify”. Adding that word to this Guiding Policy makes clear that the value of economic development does not mean any large or single solution.

²⁰ *Vibrant Economy* is one of the six desired results of the City Council’s adopted budgeting priorities.

²¹ *Healthy and Attractive Community* is one of the six desired results of the City Council’s adopted budget priorities..

²² *Reliable Infrastructure and connected mobility* is one of the six desired results of the City Council’s adopted budget priorities.

²³ *A Green, well-planned community* is one of the six desired results of the City’s adopted PBB.

²⁴ *Safe City* is one of the six desired results of the City’s adopted PBB.

LAND USE ELEMENT

TABLE OF CONTENTS

Introduction.....	1
Goals and Policies	5
Framework of the Plan.....	5
General Land Use	9
Winslow	13
Neighborhood Service Centers	23
Business/ Industrial	26
Residential Open Space	23
Historic Preservation.....	34
Siting of Essential Public Facilities	36
Existing Conditions.....	1
The Built Environment	1
2004 Update – The Built Environment	4
Figures.....	

LAND USE ELEMENT

INTRODUCTION

The Land Use Element and Environmental Element are at the heart of the Comprehensive Plan. Together they describe the balance between the distribution, location, preservation and protection of uses of land, including housing, commerce, light manufacturing, recreation, open spaces, natural resources, public utilities, public facilities, and other land uses necessary to plan for future growth in a manner that reflects the overall vision of the Comprehensive Plan.

~~The first section of the Land Use Element provides an overview of the existing pattern of development: 1) how much of the land is currently devoted to residential, commercial, light manufacturing, public facilities, and agricultural uses, 2) where these uses are located, 3) how much of the land is vacant, and 4) the future development potential on the Island.~~

~~The second section of the Element contains the goals and policies, which provide guidance for future land use.~~

Framework of the Plan

~~The Framework Goals and Policies establish the overall approach to managing growth on Bainbridge Island. As a city, Bainbridge Island is an urban growth area under GMA. However, future growth on Bainbridge will be accommodated in a manner that is consistent with the requirements of GMA, yet retains the Island's character and quality of life that its residents so highly value.~~

~~Five overriding principles guide the Plan:~~

- ~~1) Preserve the special character of the Island which includes forested areas, meadows, farms, marine views, and roads that support all forms of transportation.~~
- ~~2) Protect the water resources of the Island.~~
- ~~3) Foster the diversity of the residents of the Island.~~
- ~~4) Balance the costs and benefits to property owners in making land use decisions.~~
- ~~5) The Island's environmental resources are finite and must be maintained at a sustainable level.~~

NOTE: GUIDING PRINCIPLES ARE LOCATED IN THE INTRODUCTION TO THE COMPREHENSIVE PLAN

There is another important concept in the Plan. Due to the Island's ability to accommodate the anticipated growth through the number of existing platted lots on the Island and the unused capacity under current zoning, increase in density over current zoning should further a public purpose. The public purposes identified in the Plan are:

- 1) Shift density from critical areas and farmland to Winslow or other designated sites, such as current or future Neighborhood Service Centers.
- 2) Provide affordable housing.

NEED PC DIRECTION ~~SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16~~

- 3) Contribute to public infrastructure and public amenities in excess of what is needed to mitigate the impacts of development.

Another important component of the Plan's framework is an emphasis on establishing benchmarks against which to assess the continued viability of the Plan. A monitoring program must be created to track the success of the City in achieving the vision and goals of the Plan.

Winslow

Winslow is the area of urban concentration on the Island. The 2004 Comprehensive Plan created a *Mixed Use Town Center* (MUTC) ~~which is intended to be the vibrant, pedestrian-oriented core of Winslow, and also recommends a change of approximately 46 acres of multi-family residential designation to the Mixed Use Town Center. In the MUTC, densities of up to 28 units per acre or the equivalent in floor area ratio are recommended, but only if the increase in density over existing zoning is achieved through the use of transfer development rights (TDRs) or by providing affordable housing or contributions to infrastructure in excess of what is needed to mitigate the impacts of development.~~

NOTE: THIS CONCEPT OF BONUS FAR IS ADDRESSED IN MUTC GOALS/POLICIES

Five overlay districts are designated to address the distinct neighborhoods and commercial areas within the Mixed Use Town Center:

- *Central Core Overlay District* – To provide the commercial center; residential uses are encouraged, but not required.
- *Ericksen Avenue Overlay District* – To preserve the unique and historical features of Ericksen Avenue; retail is permitted only if on the ground floor with residential or office development above.
- *Madison Avenue Overlay District* – To provide a mix of residential and small-scale, nonresidential uses; all retail and office development must contain a residential component.
- *Gateway Overlay District* – To protect the ravine and provide low-intensity, tourist-oriented commercial, multi-family and agricultural uses.
- *Ferry Terminal* – To provide ferry and associated transportation-oriented uses and a residential/office neighborhood with limited retail adjacent to the terminal to serve commuters.

The High School Road District is meant to provide commercial uses that complement the Town Center and that benefit from auto access near SR 305. Special planning considerations are provided for coordinated development for the area in and around the ferry terminal, and for properties which abut Eagle Harbor. ~~A master plan for~~ The Winslow Master Plan will be ~~was developed~~ approved in 1998 to implement the goals and policies of the Plan. The Winslow Master Plan has been since amended, including a substantial update in 2006.

The Plan recognizes the existing residential districts in Winslow and suggests that the urban Multi-family District could be appropriate for an increase in density **with the use of TDRs after monitoring the success of the TDR program in the Mixed Use Town Center.**

Neighborhood Service Centers

The Neighborhood Service Centers will continue to serve as small-scale commercial activity centers. The base residential density within the service centers would remain at two units per acre.

Island Center

Expansion of the boundaries of Island Center would be considered part of a special planning-area process. ~~A contract zoning district for~~ The 10-acre site on the northwest corner of Miller and Battle Point Roads would be established to may continue with garden supply sales, nursery, and related uses, and provide for some possible expansion of those uses under a contract zoning district.

Lynwood Center

~~The Plan recommends one change for Lynwood Center. This change is the removal of the 10-acre parcel currently designated for commercial development in Lynwood Center and designating the parcel as appropriate for increased residential density of up to five units per acre with public water and sewer. The Lynwood Center Subarea Plan was approved in 1997 after a~~ A special planning area process (Appendix XX) is also recommended for Lynwood Center.

Rolling Bay

Expansion of the boundaries of Rolling Bay would be considered as part of a special planning area process.

Business/ Industrial (B/I)

~~The Plan recommends expansion of the existing Business/ Industrial District at Day Road by an additional 35 acres.~~ Business/Industrial (B/I) designated land is concentrated in three distinct areas:

- Day Road, east and west of SR 305
- Sportsman Club Road, between New Brooklyn and SR 305
- New Brooklyn Road, west of Madison Avenue

There is also an isolated B/I parcel located at the intersection of Fletcher Bay and Bucklin Hill Roads. It was designated as such to recognize and existing development pattern.

Federal, state, and local regulations govern the handling and disposal of hazardous substances and hazardous waste and will be used to evaluate ~~guide~~ future business/ industrial development.

Areas Outside Winslow, NSCs, and B/I

The areas of the Island outside Winslow, the neighborhood centers, and the business/ industrial areas are designated *Residential Open Space* and are characterized by forest lands, meadows, small-scale farms, and narrow, winding heavily-vegetated roadways. These areas also contain much of the Island's sensitive areas. These include aquifer recharge areas and wetlands and streams, which serve a variety of important functions, and also serve as fish and wildlife habitat. The Plan attempts to encourage a pattern of development which will preserve and protect these areas.

The City's subdivision and short plat design standards and processes should ~~Plan recommends the creation of flexible lot design subdivision and short plat processes that will encourage~~ a more creative approach than the traditional lot-by-lot development. This method addresses lot design, building placement, and circulation. Clustering of lots is encouraged, with varying lot sizes, to provide open space and protect the Island's natural systems.

A *Critical Areas Overlay District* is created for the protection of certain critical areas (wetlands and high-vulnerability recharge areas). The underlying base density is retained, but development is subject to the requirements of the overlay district. Development through clustering by using the Flexible Lot Design Subdivision Process, or the use of TDRs, is at the underlying base density. If the owner of property located in an area currently designed for development at one unit per 2.5 acres chooses to develop through a standard subdivision process, then density would be limited to one unit per ten acres.

NOTE: THE CRITICAL AREAS OVERLAY DISTRICT IS RELEVANT ONLY AS A SENDING AREA FOR A TRANSFER OF DEVELOPMENT RIGHTS (TDR) PROGRAM.

Historic Preservation

Historic Preservation Goals and Policies recognize the importance of archaeological, cultural and historic resources on the island. Bainbridge Island is a Certified Local Government (CLG) with a Historic Preservation Commission (HPC). Responsibilities of a CLG, and its HPC, include establishing an historic preservation commission, surveying local historic properties, enforcing state or local preservation laws, reviewing nominations for the state and national historic registers, maintaining a Local Historic Register and providing resources and advocacy for historic preservation.

The City is committed to the preservation and enhancement of Bainbridge Island's historic character. Historic resources, including archaeological sites, cultural places, pastoral landscapes and historic structures are important community assets. The City recognizes that these places are an essential part of Bainbridge Island's character and ~~shall~~ be identified, evaluated, and preserved.

Siting of Essential Public Facilities

~~The Plan requires the creation of a Facility and Site Evaluation Committee (composed of citizens, City staff, and elected officials) to review the siting of proposed essential public facilities. The Plan also requires that each public agency develop a notification and communications plan to ensure early public review of proposed essential public facilities and promote trust between government agencies and the community.~~

Comprehensive Plan Land Use Map

~~The Comprehensive Plan~~ Land Use maps ~~are~~ is part of the Land Use Element.

NOTE: INSERT COMP PLAN LAND USE MAP

GOALS AND POLICIES

Framework of the Plan

The GMA requires Bainbridge Island to plan, at a minimum, for the growth in population allocated to it by the Washington State Office of Financial Management and the Kitsap County Regional Planning Council. Bainbridge Island's Comprehensive Plan does accommodate projected growth in a way which is consistent with the requirements of the GMA, yet true to the community's vision and overall goals for the future.

NOTE: Guiding Principles in Introduction chapter

~~Five overriding principles goals guide the Plan:~~

- ~~1) Preserve the special character of the Island which includes forested areas, meadows, farms, marine views, and winding roads bordered by dense vegetation.~~
- ~~2) Protect the water resources of the Island.~~
- ~~3) Foster diversity of the residents of the Island, its most precious resource.~~
- ~~4) The costs and benefits to property owners should be considered in making land-use decisions.~~
- ~~5) Development should be based on the principle that the Island's environmental resources are finite and must be maintained at a sustainable level.~~

GOAL LU-1

The City of Bainbridge Island will plan for growth based on the growth targets established by the Kitsap Regional Planning Council: 5,635 ~~7,430~~ additional residents from 2010-2036 ~~1992 to 2012~~ and, at the same time, promote and sustain high standards that will not diminish the quality of life and/or degrade the environment of the Island.

FRW Policy LU 1.1

The City accepts the Kitsap Regional Planning Council (KRPC) population allocations and will continue to analyze the impacts of these allocations as the Comprehensive Plan is implemented.

On September 24, 2013 ~~June 7, 1995~~, the KRCC amended the Kitsap Countywide Planning Policies to revise the 20-year planning horizon under GMA and to revise the population forecast for the County and the subarea allocation for each of the local jurisdictions within the County. Bainbridge Island was allocated a population of 24,280 ~~28,660~~ by the year 2012 ~~2036~~. The City Council ratified the amended Countywide Planning Policies on December 11, 2013 by approving Resolution 2013-22. The ~~2010-1992~~ Island population was 23,025 ~~16,850~~ persons. With an allocation of 28,660 ~~24,280~~, the Island must plan for an increase in population of 5,635 ~~7,430~~ persons by the year 2036 ~~2012~~ (the difference between the 20-year allocated population of 24,280 and the ~~1992~~ population of 16,850). See Introduction and Land Use Element Appendices J **XX**

This Comprehensive Plan allocates more than enough development capacity to accommodate the target patterns, and opportunities for choice in residential location and lifestyle. Finally, the Plan acknowledges the planning constraints, which result from the large number of existing nonconforming and previous platted lots.

FRW Policy LU-1.2

As a city, Bainbridge Island constitutes an urban growth area under the GMA. Although an urban growth area, future growth on Bainbridge will be accommodated in a manner, which is consistent with the requirements of the GMA and yet retains the Island's character and the quality of life, which its residents so highly value.

Consistent with the Growth Management Act, all land within the City of Bainbridge Island is included in the City's urban growth area. While Bainbridge is an Island-wide City, it is not characterized by urban development with a full range of urban facilities and services, but contains a variety of development patterns that range from urban to less intense development. Winslow is the urban center of the Island. The existing Neighborhood Service Centers supplement Winslow's commercial activity, with the Business/ Industrial District providing a location for environmentally sound manufacturing businesses.

Outside of Winslow and the Neighborhood Service Centers, the Island has a rural appearance with forested areas, meadows, farms, and winding, narrow, and heavily vegetated roadways. These characteristics represent the Island character that is so highly valued by its residents. As important as preserving Island character is to its residents, of equal importance is the protection of the Island's environmentally sensitive areas. These outlying areas contain much of the Island's sensitive areas – the major recharge areas for the Island's aquifers, wetlands, and streams which serve a variety of important functions. Much of the area serves as fish and wildlife habitat. There is strong public support to encourage a pattern of development which preserves and protects this portion of the Island.

FRW Policy LU-1.3

The residential densities in the Plan focus residential growth in Winslow and other current and future centers with urban services, such as the Neighborhood Service Centers. This changes the growth strategy from the 2004 Plan, which continued, targets Winslow to accommodate 50% of the population growth in Winslow through the year 2012, with the Neighborhood Service Centers to accommodate up to 5%. The balance of the growth would be absorbed throughout the remainder of the Island. For purposes of allocating 50% of the growth, Winslow was shall be defined as Winslow Master Plan Study Area. (Figure 2.3 of the Winslow Master Plan.)

~~The 1992 population of Winslow was 3,397 persons. Fifty percent of the Island's 2012 population allocation is 3,715. Winslow is therefore targeted for a 2012 population of 7,112 persons. The 2003 population estimate for the City of Bainbridge Island as provided by the Washington State Office of Financial Management (OFM) is 21,350 people.~~

The Winslow Master Plan study area is intended to encourage a neighborhood of the Island which contains a strengthened, vital downtown where people want to live, shop and work. Outside the mixed use, higher density center, there would be a variety of housing

NEED PC DIRECTION ~~SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16~~

choices, from higher density multi-family areas immediately adjacent to the downtown to single family residential neighborhoods.

GOAL LU-2

Establish areas of urban concentration where public facility and service capacities already exist, or are being developed, and which are characterized by growth that will be served by a combination of existing and new public facilities and services.

FRW Policy LU-2.1

Winslow is the urban core of the Island, while the existing Neighborhood Service Centers are small-scale centers. In order to achieve the goals of the GMA this Plan would:

- Encourage development in areas where public facilities and services exist or can be provided in an efficient and effective manner.
- Provide a vibrant, pedestrian-oriented core.
- Reduce sprawl.
- Provide choice of housing location and lifestyle.
- Maintain and protect environmentally sensitive and resource lands.
- Encourage the retention of open spaces.
- Maintain and enhance the fish and wildlife habitat.

FRW Policy LU 2.2

Increased density over and above the existing zoning in the NSCs should only occur through a shift in density from critical areas overlay districts and farms through TDRs and through the use of density bonuses for affordable housing.

Development within the MUTC and High School Road Districts ~~shall~~ be consistent with the Winslow Master Plan (contained in the Subarea chapter of this Plan). The level of development ~~shall be is~~ determined by using Floor Area Ratio (FAR) rather than dwelling units per acre. The use of FAR may result in an increase in the base level of development (density) over the existing zoning, but will provide greater flexibility in type and size of housing units that will further the goals of this Plan.

A base level of commercial and residential density within the overlay districts of the MUTC and the High School Road districts ~~shall be established as is~~ described in the Winslow Master Plan, with an increase in the FAR allowed through the use of:

- Affordable housing.
- TDRs (transferable development rights).
- Contributions to public infrastructure and public amenities in excess of what is required to mitigate the impacts of development.
- Transfer of density within the MUTC and within the High School Road Districts.
- Preservation on-site of historic structures eligible for inclusion on a local, state or federal register of historic places.
- Locating ferry-related parking under building.

FRW Policy LU 2.3

Phasing mechanisms and/or incentives should be developed to promote the timely and logical progression of commercial and residential development.

NEED PC DIRECTION — ~~SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16~~

GOAL LU-3

This Comprehensive Plan recognizes and affirms that, as an Island, the City has natural constraints based on the carrying capacity of its natural systems. The Plan strives to establish a development pattern that is consistent with the goals of the community and compatible with the Island's natural systems.

FRW Policy LU 3.1

Recognizing that the carrying capacity of the Island is not known, the citizens of Bainbridge Island should strive to conserve and protect its natural systems, within the parameters of existing data. Revisions to the Plan should be made as new information becomes available.

The carrying capacity of Bainbridge Island is determined by many factors, including the supply of limited resources (particularly water), changes in patterns of consumption, and technological advances. This Plan acknowledges that, with current information, the carrying capacity of the Island is not known. During the timeframe of this Plan, additional information on the carrying capacity of the Island should be developed. The Plan seeks to take a balanced and responsible approach to future development. As our understanding of the Island's capacity changes, the recommendations of this Plan should be reconsidered to ensure that they continue to represent a responsible path for the long-range future of the Island.

FRW Policy LU 3.2

A public education program should be established to foster the community's understanding of the natural systems on the Island and their carrying capacity.

FRW Policy LU 3.3

This Plan recognizes that stewardship of the land is a responsibility of individual citizens and the community as a whole. Through its status as an employer and landowner, the City ~~shall~~ should take advantage of its opportunities to be an example of environmental stewardship so that others will be encouraged to follow suit.

FRW Policy LU 3.4

The City ~~shall~~ should develop a program which recognizes and rewards stewardship so that others will be encouraged to follow suit.

GOAL LU-4

Ensure that the community vision and goals embodied in this plan are actually obtained.

FRW Policy LU 4.1

Develop a series of benchmarks against which to measure the Plan's continued viability and ensure that continued public input is part of the monitoring program.

FRW Policy LU 4.2

The Action Plan to implement the Comprehensive Plan should be reviewed yearly to determine if the actions described in the Action Plan have been accomplished.

GOAL LU-5

Strive to ensure that basic community values and aspirations are reflected in the City's planning program while recognizing the rights of individuals to use and develop private property in a manner that is consistent with City regulations. Private property **shall** not be taken for public use without just compensation having been made. The property rights of landowners **shall** be protected from arbitrary and discriminatory actions.

GOAL LU-6

All government entities should strive to cooperate and serve their constituents in a fiscally sound manner.

In addition to the City government, there are three special purpose districts and the Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District and Sewer District #7 which all serve the citizens of Bainbridge Island, as well as a number of state and county agencies. This goal addresses the need for cooperation and coordination in order to serve the Island's citizens in the most cost effective manner.

GOAL LU-7

Develop a meaningful process for citizen participation which **includes** ~~tries to obtain~~ participation from all segments of the Island community.

General Land Use**GOAL LU-8-1**

Ensure a development pattern that is true to the vision for Bainbridge Island by reducing the inappropriate conversion of undeveloped land into sprawling development.

LU 1.1 Policy LU 8.1

Land use designations should reflect the priority of Bainbridge Island to remain primarily residential, with nonresidential development outside of the Winslow area concentrated in the service centers and at the designated Business/ Industrial areas.

LU 1.2 Policy LU 8.2

Winslow is the heart of Bainbridge Island. Higher intensity residential and commercial development and human activity is encouraged within Winslow's central core to create a vibrant city center, place growth where infrastructure exists, reduce reliance on the automobile, provide opportunities for affordable housing, and absorb growth that would

otherwise be scattered in outlying areas.

LU 1.3 Policy LU 8.3

The Neighborhood Service Centers of Island Center, Rolling Bay, and Lynwood Center offer small-scale, commercial and service activity outside of Winslow. These Neighborhood Service Centers should be allowed to develop at slightly higher densities to reinforce their roles as small-scale, community centers.

LU 1.4 Policy LU 8.4

New commercial centers should be considered only after detailed analysis of the economic impact of the new development shows there will be no significant, adverse impact on the existing commercial centers, including Winslow.

LU 1.5 Policy LU 8.5

The areas at Day Road and Sportsman Club Road designated as Business/ Industrial are intended to augment the Winslow Core and the Neighborhood Service Centers and serve an important function that allows a diverse economy with business retention, growth and innovation on the island.

The comprehensive land use plan for Bainbridge Island strives to provide for the full range of community needs. The Business/ Industrial District can provide economic activity that includes a variety of low-impact, nonpolluting uses that reflect and respond to changing market conditions and are compatible with the community.

LU 1.6 Policy LU 8.6

Development outside of Winslow and the neighborhood centers should be compatible with the distinctive features of the Island's open spaces, harbors, winding roads, small-scale agricultural establishments, natural landscape, and distinctive communities.

LU 1.7 Policy LU 8.7

The Future Land Use Map adopted in this Plan ~~shall~~ **establishes** the future distribution, extent, and location of generalized land uses. Uses of land on Bainbridge Island should reflect the intent of the vision, goals, and policies as well as the Land Use Map.

LU 1.8 Policy LU 8.8

Applications for development approval on Bainbridge Island should be processed within the timelines established in the City's land development regulations in order to ensure affordability, fairness, and predictability in the land development process.

LU 1.9 Policy LU 8.9

Special Planning Areas

A Special Planning Area is an area which reflects uses and/or conditions which are unique to that area and would benefit from a local and/or neighborhood planning process. The Special Planning Area process would address such issues as current use, future mix and location of uses and densities, transportation, public facilities, services and amenities, and protection of

natural systems. The Special Planning Area process would include property owners and neighborhood participation, and may include mediation as a means to resolve significant issues, if directed by the City Council. The end result of a special planning process would be a “neighborhood,” “subarea” or site-specific plan which will require an amendment to the Comprehensive Plan, unless no changes to the Plan’s policies are proposed.

Residential Goals and Policies

A specific set of residential policies are contained in the Housing Element. Goals and policies related to residential development are also located throughout the Land Use Element (e.g. Winslow, Neighborhood Service Centers and the Open Space Residential).

Commercial and Mixed Use Goals and Policies

GOAL LU-9 2

Provide attractive, conveniently located, commercial development that is appropriate in scale, configuration, and location. Such development ~~shall-is be~~ limited to the commercial and mixed use districts, the Neighborhood Service Centers, and home occupations.

LU-2.1 Policy LU 9.1

The major center for new commercial development ~~shall be-is~~ the Mixed Use Town Center and the other commercial districts in Winslow.

LU-2.2 Policy LU 9.2

The Neighborhood Service Centers should provide Island-wide small-scale commercial and service activity outside Winslow.

LU-2.3 Policy LU 9.3

Nonresidential uses should be oriented toward the pedestrian. Retail uses should be encouraged on the ground-floor to prevent blank walls with little visual interest for the pedestrian. Offices and/or residential uses should be encouraged above ground floor retail.

LU-2.4 Policy LU 9.4

Home occupations provide employment opportunities and should be permitted where they are compatible with surrounding neighborhoods and the environment.

Parking

GOAL LU-10 3

Parking lots ~~shall~~ be constructed to minimize visual and environmental impacts.

LU-3.1

~~Landscaping standards shall be established for the parking lots of multi-family, commercial, office, and mixed-use developments to provide visual screening and to limit the impacts of~~

~~impervious surfaces. Consideration should be given to the use of street trees which will allow solar access.~~

LU 3.2 Policy LU 10.1

Encourage parking in the rear or side yards of multi-family, commercial, and mixed use developments. Parking lots should be pedestrian-oriented and should provide pedestrian and bicycle routes between the street, the parking area, and the main entrance, and consideration should be given to the use of trees that allow solar access.

GOAL LU-11-4

Prioritize program goals and establish and maintain planning tools, including a purchase and transfer of development rights program, that implements the goals and policies of this Plan and allow transferring development rights from areas intended for conservation, and promoting development in areas suitable for development.

LU 4.1 Policy LU 11.1

The City should develop a Transfer of Development Rights (TDR) program which establishes requirements and procedures for transfer of development rights from sending areas to receiving areas. The TDR program should contain provisions for the sale and purchase of development rights.

LU 4.2 Policy LU 11.2

The City recognizes the need to take a proactive role in the purchase and transfer of development rights and such a program should include:

- 1) Designating appropriate staff resources to promote the program;
- 2) Providing for the outright purchase of development rights by the City and establishing a fund for banking development rights; and
- 3) Creating a mechanism that coordinates the purchase and transfer of development rights.

Discussion: This policy should be undertaken only after implementation of Policy LU 4.3 has been completed and the TDR program has been determined to be feasible.

LU 4.3 Policy LU 11.3

The City ~~should undertake a study to~~ has identified and prioritized areas (or resources) of the Island that are valued by the community and are appropriate for conservation through the purchase and/or the transfer of development rights (TDR) program. These areas or resources ~~shall be~~ have been identified as appropriate “sending areas” in the TDR program.

Discussion: Appropriate sending areas for example, could contain sensitive lands that are not protected by the critical areas regulations, priority links in the Wildlife Corridor, priority open space lands, or historic resources. Determination of appropriate sending areas should also be coordinated with the development of an Island-wide open space plan.

LU 4.4 (Moved from OS 2.6) Policy LU 11.4

The City should initiate an outreach program to educate property owners and potential buyers about the use of the Purchase and Transfer of Development Rights program.

Winslow*Winslow Mixed Use and Commercial Districts***GOAL LU-12 1**

The Winslow mixed use and commercial districts are designed to strengthen the vitality of downtown Winslow as a place for people to live, shop, and work. The Mixed Use Town Center is intended to have a strong, residential component to encourage a lively community during the day and at night. The most intense commercial area in Winslow is in the Central Core Overlay District. In this area, a vertical mix of uses is encouraged, but exclusively retail and/or office uses are permitted as well. In other areas of the Mixed Use Town Center District, office and retail uses should include a residential component.

W-1.1 Policy LU 12.1

The Mixed Use Town Center is intended for select areas within one mile of the ferry terminal and particularly the downtown core area, which is within one-half mile of the ferry terminal, that are suitable for pedestrian-oriented development.

W-1.2 Policy LU 12.2

The Mixed Use Town Center District includes diversity in types of housing, shopping, civic facilities, recreation, and employment. A variety of land uses are allowed which promote a pedestrian atmosphere, enhance the viability of the Town Center and can be developed in a manner which is harmonious with the scale of the Town Center. Land uses which require outdoor storage or which have primarily an auto orientation, such as drive-through establishments, are not permitted within the Mixed Use Town Center.

W-1.3 Policy LU 12.3

To ensure the visual appeal and pedestrian-orientation of the land uses, the land development regulations ~~shall~~ include design standards for:

- Building height, bulk, and placement.
- Landscaping.
- Land coverage.
- Open space.
- Parking requirements.
- Signage.
- Street improvements.

W-1.4 Policy LU 12.4

The base levels of development in the Mixed Use Town Center and High School Road

Districts ~~shall be~~ are determined by the floor area ratios (FAR) established in the Winslow Master Plan. A maximum level of development may be achieved through the use of FAR bonus provisions established in the Winslow Master Plan, including Transfer Development Rights, an affordable housing density bonus or contributions to public infrastructure or public amenities in excess of what is required to mitigate development impacts.

W-1.5 Policy LU 12.5

The area north of Bainbridge Performing Arts to High School Road, between Madison and Ericksen Avenues, is most appropriate for high-density, residential uses.

W-1.6

~~The permanent location of City Hall should be in downtown Winslow.~~

W-1.7

~~A master plan for Winslow will be developed to implement the goals and policies of this Plan.~~

W-1.8 Policy LU 12.6

Develop a parking plan for the Mixed Use Town Center District in order to ensure the viability of the Center. The Plan should include provision for shared parking, parking opportunities off Winslow Way, reduction of the parking requirements for areas within the Center, and identification of areas which could be developed as small, public parking lots to serve the businesses, and the Plan should consider the use of street trees that allow solar access. Establish a public/private partnership, such as a Parking Authority, to implement the parking plan.

A Parking Authority could assist with funding, site acquisition, planning, engineering, and traffic studies, and create an overall integrated plan of action with sequential implementation.

W-1.9 Policy LU 12.7

Monitor the success in achieving the Plan's goal to increase the vitality of the Mixed Use Town Center and the effectiveness of the bonus density program. The monitoring program ~~shall include~~ tracking the use of TDRs, the affordable-housing density bonus and bonuses for contributions to public facilities, the types of businesses which are located in the Town Center, and the number and frequency of business changes.

There is some concern that the increased density in the Town Center will not be achieved if it can only be accomplished through the use of TDRs or an affordable housing density bonus. Through a regular monitoring program, an assessment can be made as to whether the goals of the Plan are being achieved and if not, corrective measures should be taken.

W-1.10 Policy LU 12.8

Pursue the construction of a waterfront trail system.

GOAL LU-13 2

Maintain ~~Develop~~ overlay districts to that distinguish among the ~~distinct~~ neighborhoods and commercial areas within the Mixed Use Town Center.

There are a number of distinct neighborhoods or commercial centers within the Mixed Use Town Center. Development within the Town Center should reflect the different qualities and characteristics of these distinct areas. Except where explicitly stated, the permitted uses and densities are uniform throughout the Mixed Use Town Center. However, design standards and mix of uses may vary. The overlay districts establish these variations. Also, the goal of achieving pedestrian-oriented development is sought throughout the Town Center.

W-2.1 Policy LU 13.1

Encourage neighborhood participation in defining the design standards for each overlay district.

Central Core Overlay District

W-2.2 Policy LU 13.2

The Central Core Overlay District is the most intense district within the Mixed Use Town Center. Within this overlay district, residential uses are encouraged, but exclusive office and/or retail uses are permitted.

W-2.3 Policy LU 13.3

Design standards, including open space, parking and landscaping, ~~which~~ recognize the urban character of the Central Core Overlay District and apply to future development, ~~shall be developed~~.

~~Discussion:~~ In general, open space and landscaping standards may be more relaxed in this district in favor of building placement and lot coverage standards which create a continuous urban façade.

W-2.4 Policy LU 13.4

Mixed Use developments within the Central Core Overlay District that include a residential component may be exempt from requirements to provide off-street parking for the residential component of the project. When establishing the parking requirements for such a project, the City ~~shall~~ should consider the extent to which the shared parking will satisfy residents' parking demand.

W-2.5

~~The existing mobile home park in the Central Core District provides an affordable housing alternative and should be encouraged to remain. With retention of these mobile homes, the unused development potential from the parcels on which the mobile home park is located may be transferred to another parcel within the MUTC and a mechanism should be established to allow the permanent preservation of the mobile homes to be used as an affordable housing bonus on another parcel within the MUTC.~~

NEED PC DIRECTION SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

Discussion: ~~Specific policies which relate to the mobile home park are contained in the Housing Element.~~

W-2.6 Policy LU 13.5

Provide improved pedestrian access to the waterfront from the Central Core.

Ericksen Avenue Overlay District

W-2.7 Policy LU 13.6

The Ericksen Avenue Overlay District is intended to preserve the unique and historical features of the Ericksen Avenue neighborhood and to provide for a mix of residential and small-scale, nonresidential development, with provision for open space.

W-2.8 Policy LU 13.7

~~New multi-story r~~Retail development is permitted within the Ericksen Avenue Overlay District only if it is ground floor retail with a residential component ~~or residential and office development in the upper floors.~~

W-2.9 Policy LU 13.8

Historic (pre-1920) single-family, residential structures on Ericksen may be converted to nonresidential use. However, any additions to the structure must be added to the rear and must be compatible with the character of the original structure. Exceptions may be made, when appropriate, through a variance process.

Discussion: Policies related to the historic structures on Ericksen Avenue are contained in the Historic Preservation section of this Element.

W-2.10 Policy LU 13.9

New buildings within the Ericksen Overlay District must be constructed so that the overall character of the street, including traditional building forms, roof shapes, and relationship of building to street, is compatible with that of the historic structures on Ericksen Avenue.

Discussion: The mass of the new building, its relation to open spaces, and its doors, windows, and openings should be visually compatible with the historic structures on Ericksen.

Madison Avenue Overlay District

W-2.11 Policy LU 13.10

The Madison Avenue Overlay District is intended to provide for a mix of residential and small-scale, nonresidential development.

W-2.12 Policy LU 13.11

~~Within the Madison Avenue Overlay District, all retail and office development shall include a residential component~~ mixed-use development is encouraged. ~~New multi-story r~~Retail

development is permitted only if it is ~~ground-floor retail~~ with a residential component ~~or residential and office development on the upper floors.~~

Gateway Overlay District

W-2.13 Policy LU 13.12

The area along SR 305 from Winslow Way ~~to the northern boundary of John Nelson Park~~ past the Vineyard Lane to the north is the gateway to Bainbridge Island and should be utilized in a way which enhances its role as the gateway.

W-2.14 Policy LU 13.13

The Gateway Overlay District ~~would~~ provides protection for the ravine. The District would permit low-intensity, tourist-oriented, commercial, multi-family, and agricultural uses which would have limited parking and minimum traffic impact. Limited, impervious surface coverage ~~would be~~ is allowed. If changes to SR 305 are made, then the uses permitted in the District will be re-examined.

W-2.15 Policy LU 13.14

The ravine is an important, natural feature of Bainbridge Island and ~~should~~ must be protected. A high priority ~~should be given~~ is to purchasing properties or obtaining conservation easements where the ravine is located to provide a permanent open space and connect a trail along the ravine.

Commercial-Ferry Terminal District

GOAL LU-14 3

The Ferry Terminal Overlay District is intended to provide an attractive setting for ferry and associated transportation-oriented uses and serve as the entry point into Winslow. This District is also intended as a new pedestrian and transit oriented, mixed-use neighborhood that complements the character and vitality of the core and serves the neighborhood and commuters.

W-3.1 Policy LU 14.1

Limit commuter parking and locate parking underground below new residential/office development in the ferry terminal wherever feasible.

W-3.2 Policy LU 14.2

Require new development to provide landscaping, landscape buffers and signage that enhances the setting of this visually important area, and limits the undesirable visual impacts of parking lots.

W-3.3 Policy LU 14.3

Protect adjacent, residential zones from the encroachment of parking, traffic impacts, and development.

W-3.4 Policy LU 14.4

Landscaping and signage standards should provide an attractive entry point that emphasizes Winslow's intimate character and natural setting.

Ferry Terminal Planning Area**GOAL LU-15 4**

Planning for the Ferry Terminal and Gateway Districts should be coordinated

W-4.1 Policy LU 15.1

The Ferry Terminal and Gateway Districts ~~should be~~ **are** developed in cooperation with the City, Washington State Department of Transportation, Kitsap Transit, and the private landowners to ensure coordinated and consistent development. The Ferry Terminal plan should address such issues as design standards, coordinated transportation analysis, pedestrian and visual connections between the ferry terminal and the Winslow Way retail center, and environmental review.

Commercial High School Road District**GOAL LU-16 5**

The Commercial High School Road District is intended to provide for commercial uses that complement downtown Winslow and benefit from automobile access near the highway, while creating a pedestrian-friendly retail area.

W-5.1 Policy LU 16.1

The Commercial High School Road District is intended for the area that is suitable for commercial development near the intersection of High School Road and SR 305.

W-5.2 Policy LU 16.2

The Commercial High School Road District includes a diversity in types of shopping and employment. A variety of commercial uses are allowed which offer goods and services for the convenience of Island residents and which may have an automobile orientation. Housing at a density of 8 units per acre is also permitted.

W-5.3 Policy LU 16.3

The properties designated on the Land Use Map as High School Road District II ~~shall be~~ **are each** limited to no more than 14,400 square feet of retail use. Retail use between 5,000 and 14,400 square feet ~~shall require~~ **a conditional use permit.**

Discussion: This portion of High School Road, designated High School Road District II on the Land Use Map, is immediately adjacent to a semi-urban, residential area of 2.9 to 3.5 units per acre and should have less intense uses than the remainder of the High School Road district. Since existing businesses are located in this area and infrastructure is in place, this Plan recommends the area for the High School Road designation, but with a limitation on the size of retail uses.

W-5.4 Policy LU 16.4

To ensure visual appeal and pedestrian and bicycle safety, the land development regulations ~~shall include~~ design standards for:

- Building height, bulk, and placement.
- Landscaping, including screening of parking lots, and development of pedestrian oriented streetscape with building and landscaping (including trees) located at the street edge.
- Lot coverage.
- Open space.
- Road access and internal circulation including pedestrian connections on all sides of the retail area from the high density housing adjacent to High School Road; developing more pedestrian crossings; and requiring parking in the rear wherever possible.
- Signage.
- Additional transit stops on both sides of SR 305.

W-5.5 Policy LU 16.5

To visually screen development year-round, pProperties with frontage along SR 305 ~~shall~~ provide a vegetated buffer along the highway that ~~shall include~~ the preservation and protection of existing vegetation, ~~to visually screen the development year-round from the highway.~~ Access to these properties ~~shall~~ should not be directly from SR 305.

W 5.6 Policy LU 16.6

If an existing development redevelops or expands its gross floor area (GFA), compliance with current development standards ~~shall be~~ is based on the size of the redevelopment or expansion. A range of compliance requirements ~~shall be established to~~ will correspond ~~to a with~~ range in levels of redevelopment or expansion.

Water-dependent Industrial District**GOAL LU-17 6**

Allow for the continuation of water-dependent, industrial uses on Bainbridge Island in order to preserve elements of a working waterfront within the urban shoreline area. Water-dependent uses require direct contact with the water and cannot exist at a non-water location due to the intrinsic nature of the operation.

W-6.1 Policy LU 17.1

The Water-dependent Industrial District is intended primarily to provide for ship and boat building and boat repair yards. Preference should be given to small, local, boat haul-out and repair facilities, and water-oriented industry which serves boating needs.

W-6.2 Policy LU 17.2

Water-dependent industrial development ~~shall not~~ be located on sensitive and ecologically valuable shorelines such as natural accretion shore forms, marshes, bogs, swamps, salt marshes and tidal flats, and wildlife habitat areas, nor on shores inherently hazardous to such

NEED PC DIRECTION SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

development, such as flood and erosion prone areas and steep and unstable slopes.

W-6.3 Policy LU 17.3

Industrial uses ~~shall~~ employ best management practices (BMPs) and best available facilities practices and procedures concerning the various services and activities performed and their impacts on the surrounding water quality. (For example, practices and procedures include safe handling of fuels and toxic hazardous materials to prevent them from entering the water and providing optimum means to provide prompt and effective clean-up of spills that do occur.)

W-6.4 Policy LU 17.4

Regional and statewide needs for industrial facilities should be carefully considered in reviewing new proposals, as well as in allocating shorelines for such development. Such reviews or allocations should be coordinated with port districts, adjacent counties and cities, and the State in order to minimize new industrial development that would ~~unnecessarily~~ duplicate under-utilized facilities elsewhere in the region, or result in unnecessary adverse impacts.

W-6.5 Policy LU 17.5

Expansion or redevelopment of existing, legally established industrial areas, facilities, and services with the possibility of incorporating mixed use development should be encouraged over the addition and/or location of new or single-purpose industrial facilities. Such development or redevelopment for mixed use should occur through a master planned development process in areas designated appropriate for such urban shoreline uses.

W-6.6 Policy LU 17.6

Joint use of piers, cargo handling, storage, parking, and other accessory facilities among private or public entities should be strongly encouraged or required in waterfront industrial areas.

W-6.7 Policy LU 17.7

New or expanded industrial development should be required to provide physical and/or visual access to shorelines and visual access to facilities whenever possible, and when such public access does not cause significant interference with operations or hazards to life and property.

W-6.8 Policy LU 17.8

~~The land use designation for the Wyckoff site should reflect what types of land use activities would be appropriate for the site based, in part, on historical significance, habitat mitigation implemented and performed on the property and the development restrictions required by the Environmental Protection Agency.~~

Discussion: EPA has begun cleanup at the Wyckoff Superfund Site and constructed a habitat mitigation beach along the western portion of the site. The Japanese American WWII Exclusion Memorial is proposed on the site and the adjacent Taylor Avenue. A public park

~~is proposed for the remainder of the site. Mixed use development may be appropriate if public acquisition is not successful. Current actions by EPA focus on removal and containment of contamination. Future land use of the site may be affected by EPA's final cleanup action, the technologies used, and the time required to complete the cleanup.~~

Winslow Residential Districts

GOAL LU-18-7

The Urban Multi-Family District is intended to provide for moderate to high-density residential development that may include some office and governmental uses, and are permitted as conditional uses.

Most of the residential districts include some office and governmental uses that are permitted as conditional uses.

W-7.1 Policy LU 18.1

Residential development within the Urban Multi-Family District ~~shall be~~ **is** served by public facilities and services normally associated with urban area development.

W-7.2 Policy LU 18.2

Retain the existing densities of residential uses which range from 8 to a maximum of 14 units per acre within the Urban Multi-Family District.

~~**Discussion:**~~ The monitoring program to be established for the Mixed Use Town Center will help assess whether the Urban Multi-Family District should be designated for additional density through the use of TDRs.

W-7.3 Policy LU 18.3

Provide landscape buffers between any multi-family and existing single family homes.

W-7.4 Policy LU 18.4

To ensure the compatibility of multi-family developments with adjacent uses and retain the scale of development in Winslow, land use regulations ~~shall includes~~ design standards for:

- Building height, bulk, massing, and articulation to promote a pedestrian scale and to ensure adequate light, air, and view corridors between lots.
- Parking requirements, including location of parking to the rear or side yards.
- Landscaping, including parking lots.
- Lighting standards that prevent unnecessary glare on neighboring residential properties.
- Location and screening of service areas such as dumpsters.
- Open space.
- Pedestrian linkages between multi-family buildings and the street edge and adjacent residential or commercial properties.

Urban Residential District

GOAL LU-19 8

The Urban Residential District is intended for moderate density urban residential development.

W-8.1 Policy LU 19.1

Residential development within the Urban Residential District ~~shall be~~ is served by public facilities and services normally associated with urban area development.

W-8.2 Policy LU 19.2

Densities of residential use within the Urban Residential District ~~shall~~ range from 4.3 to a maximum of 6 units per acre.

W-8.3

~~The Urban Residential District on the Point Monroe sand spit is intended for small, beach-oriented residences that are compatible with its sensitive environmental setting.~~

W-8.4

~~New development or expansion of development in the Urban Residential District on the Point Monroe sand spit shall consider the cumulative impacts of additional requests for like actions on the remainder of lots on the sand spit. The total of new development on the sand spit shall not produce substantial adverse effects on the shoreline environment or neighborhood character, and shall prevent or minimize flood damage through use of non-structural methods, such as increased setbacks and vegetated buffers, in addition to design measures such as pile foundations and elevated floor levels.~~

Semi-Urban Residential District

GOAL LU-20-9

The Semi-Urban Residential District is intended to provide for vital residential neighborhoods in a semi-urban setting.

W-9.1 Policy LU 20.1

The Semi-Urban Residential District is located in areas that are suitable to provide a transition from urban uses to the less intensely developed areas of the Island.

W-9.2 Policy LU 20.2

Density of residential use within the Semi-Urban Residential District ~~shall~~ range from 2.9 to a maximum of 3.5 units per acres.

W-9.3

High School Road/Ferncliff Avenue

~~The 9+ acres located at the northwest corner of High School and Ferncliff Roads is designated as R-2, with the six western acres (approximately) of the nine acres designated as R-8. No density bonuses will be permitted on either portion of the site and development of this site is encouraged to be clustered on the western portion of the property, with a significant buffer retained along the eastern boundary of the site along Ferncliff Avenue.~~

~~**Discussion:** The density bonus restriction is due to the property's transitional location, between the high-intensity commercial area on High School Road and the lower density residential area associated with Ferncliff Avenue.~~

Neighborhood Service Centers

The Neighborhood Service Centers provide Island-wide commercial and service activity outside Winslow. These areas should be developed at slightly higher densities to reinforce their roles as community service centers. The service centers will also help reduce traffic congestion by providing an alternative to shopping in Winslow.

GOAL LU-21 1

Encourage the development of the Neighborhood Service Centers at Rolling Bay, Lynwood, and Island Centers, as designated on the Land Use Map, as areas with small-scale, Island-wide, commercial, mixed use and residential development outside Winslow.

NSC-1.1 Policy LU 21.1

Allow development of Neighborhood Service Centers in areas designated on the Land Use Map.

NSC-1.2 Policy LU 21.2 Lynwood Center

Any new development or expansion of existing development in Lynwood Center will be required to connect to public sewer, when available, or meet other Health District requirements, when appropriate.

Lynwood Center is designated as a Special Planning Area, and a subarea plan was completed in 1997.

~~Reduce the commercial area of Lynwood Center as shown on the Land Use Map. Allow R-5 is allowed with public water and sewer in the area, that has been changed from commercial to residential use. The use of TDRs or affordable housing bonus density would not be required, but affordable housing would be encouraged.~~

~~Rezone the Island Trade District to Neighborhood Service Center to ensure coordinated and compatible uses in the neighborhood service center. Allow up to 12 residential units per acre along with commercial uses (if served by public sewer and water) on the commonly owned parcels on Lynwood Center between Baker Hill Road and Point White Drive, as shown on the Land Use Map (Tax Parcel #s 042402-1-012-2006, 042402-1-047-2005, 042402-1-048-~~

NEED PC DIRECTION SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

~~2004, 042402-1-049-2003, 042402-1-050-2009), provided that a community center is constructed that is of similar style and quality to the entire development. Higher density may be achieved with affordable housing.~~

~~Allow the existing lumberyard pier (Tax Parcel # 042402-1-019-2009) to be rebuilt with commercial uses consistent with the Bainbridge Island Shoreline Management master Program, 1996. Parking for this use must be located either on the parcel directly north of this parcel (Tax Parcel # 042402-1-046-2006) or on that parcel to the west (Tax Parcel # 042402-1-021-2005). The City should pursue public funds, whether from the sale of road end property or other sources, to combine with private funds to construct a public access pier or acquire other public beach access.~~

~~The parcel of land located on Point White Drive, directly adjacent to the western boundary of the NSC, as shown on the Land Use Map (Tax Parcel # 042402-1-021-2005), is designated OSR-2 with the provision that density may be increased to 3 units per acre on the condition that a public access easement be granted for that portion of the parcel that lies to the south of Point White Drive along the waters of Rich Passage and adjacent to the old lumberyard pier.~~

~~Any future development adjacent to the Shel-chelb estuary and associated stream corridor should consider the sensitive nature of this unique environmentally sensitive area.~~

~~The Lynwood Center Report and Final Recommendations is included in the section of the Comprehensive Plan entitled Subarea Plans.~~

NSC 1.3 Policy LU 21.3 Island Center

Island Center is designated as a Special Planning Area. The boundaries for Island Center are as shown on the Land Use Map. Any changes to the boundaries may be determined during the special planning process.

NSC 1.4 Policy LU 21.4 NSC Contract Zone: Miller Road/Battle Point Drive

The 16.7-acre site on Miller Road ~~will be~~ is designated a contract zone to recognize the activities currently occurring on-site under the provisions of an Unclassified Use Permit and to consider some expansion of those activities.

NSC 1.5 Policy LU 21.5 Rolling Bay

The Neighborhood Service Center boundaries are as shown on the Land Use Map. Rolling Bay is designated as a Special Planning Area. Any changes to the boundaries may be determined during the special planning process.

NSC 1.3 Policy LU 21.6

The Neighborhood Service Centers should achieve a mix of neighborhood-scale businesses, public uses, and housing which are compatible with the scale and intensity of the surrounding residential neighborhood and which minimize the impact of noise, odor, lighting, fire safety, and transportation on the neighborhood

NSC 1.7 Policy LU 21.7

Mixed use development is encouraged but not required.

~~NSC 1.8~~ Policy LU 21.8

Proposed uses must consider the impact on water quality, stormwater runoff, and environmentally sensitive areas such as wetlands, streams and high vulnerability recharge areas.

~~NSC 1.9~~ Policy LU 21.9

The land use regulations ~~shall have~~ has design standards for:

- Building height, bulk, massing and articulation to promote a pedestrian scale.
- Parking requirements, including location of parking to the rear or side yards, unless otherwise provided for in a Special Planning Area plan. Landscaping, including parking lots and buffer areas between higher and lower intensity uses and consideration of trees that allow solar access.
- Lighting standards that prevent unnecessary glare on neighboring residential properties.
- Location and screening of service areas such as dumpsters.
- Open space.
- Pedestrian linkages.

Discussion: These standards ~~should be established to~~ ensure that development will be designed to fit into the scale and character of the existing centers and the adjacent residential neighborhoods. The City ~~should developed~~ design prototypes or illustrated design guidelines for each of the three service centers to serve as a visual reference for the future development of the community. These design guidelines ~~should~~ recognize the distinct qualities of the three service centers.

~~NSC 1.10~~ Policy LU 21.10

Encourage neighborhood participation in defining the design standards for each service center.

~~NSC 1.11~~ Policy LU 21.11

Establish and implement a street tree plan and planting program for major roadways at the Neighborhood Service Centers.

~~NSC 1.12~~ Policy LU 21.12

Develop a parking plan, if appropriate, for each service center.

~~NSC 1.13~~ Policy LU 21.13

Opportunities for providing a neighborhood commons or meeting place should be considered with any proposal for major redevelopment of an existing neighborhood service center or as part of development of a new neighborhood service center to encourage the use of the neighborhood service center by surrounding residents.

GOAL LU-22 2

Infill within the boundaries of the Neighborhood Service Centers, as designated on the Land Use Map, through the transfer of development rights from TDR Sending Areas of the Island or through an affordable housing bonus density.

NSC 2.1 Policy LU 22.1

The base density of residential development in the Neighborhood Service Centers, as designated on the Land Use Map, ~~shall be~~ **is** 3 units per acre in areas not served by public water and sewer systems and **using TDRs** or an affordable-housing bonus density, provided state and local Health District regulations can be met. Allow up to R-5 with public water and sewer.

NOTE: Insert new goal and policies re: neighborhood nodes/ centers

Business/ Industrial**GOAL LU-23 1**

The Business/ Industrial District (B/I) is intended to provide opportunities for expansion of existing Island businesses, for diversity of jobs and for low-impact industrial activity that contributes to well paying jobs, where traffic congestion, visual, and other impacts on the surrounding neighborhood can be minimized.

Policy LU 23.1 B/I 1.1

The Business/ Industrial District is for non-polluting, light manufacturing development as well as other uses that add to the diversity of economic activity on the island and are compatible with other uses in the Business/ Industrial District and neighboring zones.

Policy LU 23.2 B/I 1.2

New manufacturing businesses that plan to utilize toxic/hazardous substances must list these substances and quantities projected for annual usage; demonstrate compliance with all Federal, State and Bremerton-Kitsap County Health District requirements for their handling; ~~and receive a City business license. Development proposals are evaluated using performance standards for the B/I district. (Definitions and quantity limits of toxic/hazardous substances are set forth in the Comprehensive Environmental Response, Compensation, and Liability Act of 1980, as amended [42 U.S.C. Section 9601] et seq. ["CERCLA"], the Superfund Amendments and Reauthorization Act of 1986, Pub. L No. 99-499 ["SARA"], the Hazardous Materials Transportation Act, 49 U.S.C. Section 1801 et seq., the Resource Conservation and Recovery Act, 49 U.S.C. Section 6901 et seq. or other applicable State or Federal laws, rules or regulations adopted in accordance with those statutes).~~ Uses of certain toxic/hazardous substances can disqualify the application from approval because of potential environmental impact. However, the City would consider proposals that use toxic/hazardous substances defined in the above references may be approved upon review of factors such as quantity used, adequacy of storage, containment, spill management, and waste disposal plans in reviewing such a proposal.

NEED PC DIRECTION SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

Policy LU 23.3 B/I 1.3

The City shall coordinate with the Bainbridge Island Fire Department when reviewing development proposals. ~~The Fire Marshall shall receive copies of publicly available reports concerning hazardous substances and prepare a summary of those reports that can be published in order to avoid revealing confidential or sensitive information about other aspects of those businesses.~~

Policy LU 23.4 B/I 1.4

Applications for development approval within the Business/ Industrial District must show that adequate water, wastewater, transportation, fire, and storm drainage services are available to serve the development.

Policy LU 23.5 B/I 1.5

The City should ensure the adequate monitoring and enforcement of hazardous material regulations.

Policy LU 23.6 B/I 1.6

Performance standards for the Business/ Industrial District(s) shall address odor, lighting, noise, vibration, signage, traffic volumes, ingress and egress, parking, delivery and loading areas, and pedestrian and vehicle site circulation, to create safe, efficient, compatible conditions among a variety of on-site uses and to protect adjacent residential neighborhoods.

Policy LU 23.7 B/I 1.7

Business/ Industrial uses shall ~~must be~~ visually screened the development year-round from adjacent, non-industrial properties and from adjacent roadways.

Discussion: This policy establishes a performance standard – Business/ Industrial uses must be visually screened from the roadway and from adjacent non- Business/ Industrial development. The visual screening could be achieved through a combination of vegetation and building setback which would add depth to the buffer. ~~A minimum 50 foot native, vegetated buffer should be considered in drafting the development regulations.~~

B/I 1.8

~~Any Business/ Industrial District with more than one business should be encouraged to form and participate in a business park management association and neighborhood association in order to institute a self-enforcement program.~~

Policy LU 23.8 B/I 1.9

If an existing project redevelops or expands its gross floor area (GFA), compliance with current development standards shall be ~~are~~ based on the size of the redevelopment or expansion. A range of compliance requirements shall be ~~established to~~ correspond with the range in levels of redevelopment or expansion.

Discussion: ~~If an expansion comprises no more than 15%, only limited compliance with current standards would be required (i.e., landscaping, parking). An expansion of 50% or more would require that the entire project be brought into full compliance.~~

GOAL LU-24 2

Provide appropriate land for Business/ Industrial in order to provide opportunities for small manufacturing businesses on the Island to expand, and to provide additional employment opportunities.

BI 2.1

~~The 35 acres adjacent to the Business/ Industrial area north of Day Road and west of SR 305 are designated as Business/ Industrial on the Land Use Map, and development within this 35-acre Business/ Industrial area must utilize the Site Plan Review process for project review to address open space, trail connections and environmental impacts associated with proposed development.~~

BI 2.2

~~Any additional Business/ Industrial should not be designated until the City completes an Economic Development Element.~~

Discussion: ~~The City will monitor achievement of this goal. Details of the monitoring program will be enumerated in an Economic Development Element.~~

GOAL LU-24 3

Discourage the inappropriate designation of isolated Business/ Industrial Districts.

While seeking to limit isolated Business/ Industrial uses, this Plan also recognizes the concerns of property owners to continue existing businesses at those locations. Discussion included designation of certain businesses and nonconforming uses. However, owners were concerned about the ability to obtain financing in the future. This Plan seeks to reach a compromise.

Policy LU 25.1 BI 3.1

Isolated Business/ Industrial zones are designated to reflect historical use and the designation should not be expanded.

~~The overall framework of the Plan is to concentrate Business/ Industrial activity at Day Road and to acknowledge the existing, isolated Business/ Industrial activity.~~

Residential Open Space

GOAL LU-25 1

Adopt a conservation strategy to p~~Preserve the open space area outside Winslow and the Neighborhood Service Centers through a development~~ **land use pattern which will that enhances the character of the area – forested areas, meadows, farms, narrow roads bordered by dense vegetation scenic and winding roads that support all forms of transportation** – and the valuable functions the open space area serves on the Island (i.e., aquifer recharge, fish and wildlife habitat, recreation).

Preservation and protection of the open space area is also addressed elsewhere in this Element of the Plan in the Environmental, Greenways, Forest Lands and Agricultural Lands sections.

Policy LU 25.1 OS 1.1

Protect open space, critical areas, and agricultural uses through public and private initiatives, including open space tax incentives, cluster development, PUDs, transfer and purchase of development rights, public land acquisition, greenways, conservation easements, landowner compacts, limiting the amount of lot coverage, and other techniques.

Policy LU 25.2 OS 1.2

Encourage the aggregation of nonconforming lots of record and undeveloped subdivisions and short plats in order to achieve a development pattern that is consistent with goals of the Plan to preserve open space, provide a greenway through the Island, protect environmentally sensitive areas, and protect the water resources.

Discussion: The proliferation of approved short plats and the existence of standard subdivisions on the Island present a major obstacle to the preservation of the Island's character and the protection of its natural systems. The City should encourage the creation of landowner compacts where adjacent landowners collectively aggregate and develop their properties under a unified development plan. This could involve innovative, joint partnerships between nonprofit organizations and developers interested in preserving open space and promoting sensitive development. The City should work with nonprofit agencies to identify techniques for establishing landowner compacts and potential lands that could be aggregated under a compact.

Policy LU 25.3 OS 1.3

To reflect the policies in the Housing Element to provide for a variety of housing options in areas designated for residential development, including residential open space, accessory dwelling units shall be considered allowed uses in all residential zoning districts except R-6. (See Housing Element policy H 3.2)

Policy LU 25.4 OS 1.4

Existing vegetated buffers should be retained to preserve the Island's character and the forested view from the road.

Policy LU 25.5 OS1.5

New development should strive to be responsive to the natural landscape and should be sited so as to have the least visual and environmental impact on the Island landscape. Features which enhance the Island's character, such as barns, fences, fruit or agricultural stands, should be retained and encouraged.

Policy LU 25.6 OS1.6

Tree-covered hillsides and hilltops, particularly ridge lines so valued by the community, shall be particularly protected for their visual and aesthetic benefits to the Island as well as their functions as wildlife habitat and erosion and runoff retardation.

Policy LU 25.7 OS1.7

Water or wastewater infrastructure, which may contribute to system capacity exceeding local need, shall not be used to justify development counter to the City-wide land use policies.

Policy LU 25.8 OS1.8

Development should be designed and located so as to avoid or minimize potential conflicts with agricultural activities, and right-to-farm ordinances must be recognized by any development located adjacent to agricultural land.

OS 1.9

~~The City shall develop a Flexible Lot Design Subdivision process that integrates a cluster-zoning requirement in the subdivision process and ensures that the approval process is timely and efficient.~~

~~**Discussion:** This process would permit development flexibility that will encourage a more creative approach than lot by lot development, including lot design, placement of buildings, use of open spaces, and circulation that best addresses the site characteristics of geography, topography, size, or shape. This method permits clustering of lots, with a variety of lot sizes, to provide open space and protect the Island's natural systems. The criteria for the layout and design of lots, including a minimum lot size for each zone, would be set out in the zoning ordinance.~~

OS 1.10

~~In designing a Flexible Lot Design Subdivision process, areas of site disturbance shall be laid out in consideration of the following criteria:~~

- ~~• Location of the most suitable soils for individual, on-site septic systems.~~
- ~~• Location of greenway overlay.~~
- ~~• Location of scenic views from the roadway.~~
- ~~• Location of wooded slopes — trees should not be removed from ridges and structures should not be placed on ridge lines.~~
- ~~• Establishment of perimeter buffers.~~
- ~~• Segregation of farmland.~~
- ~~• Encourage common access.~~

OS 1.11

The Flexible Lot Design Subdivision shall include:

- Adequate open space—open space should be of a quality, quantity, and configuration to ensure that a significant portion of the site is designated for conservation, passive recreation, and active recreation (where appropriate), and that the open space is reasonably related to all house lots.
- Consideration for dedication of open space for public use.
- Protection of critical areas.
- Preservation of significant trees.
- Creative site design including placement of structures, circulation systems, and utilities that minimize land alteration (e.g., a variety of lot sizes, building types, scale, and design to reduce the bulk of structures).
- Pedestrian orientation, including trails and walking paths.
- Adequate provision of public facilities and amenities.
- Preservation of natural features.
- Preservation or creation of farmland.
- Limited impervious surface/area of site disturbance.
- Public waterfront access and/or view.

OS 1.12

Land that is designated as permanent open space within Flexible Lot Design Subdivisions shall be used only for recreational, conservation, or agricultural use. This land shall be:

- Owned jointly or in common by the owners of the building lots.
- Dedicated to the City, Park District, or to a private, nonprofit organization, subject to acceptance.
- Retained by the original landowner and protected through a permanent conservation easement.

GOAL LU-26-2

Create a Critical Areas Overlay District to protect sensitive areas through TDRs, flexible lot design, and through reducing development pressure within the open space area.

NOTE: THIS SECTION UNDER GOAL LU 26 NEEDS PC DIRECTION

Policy LU 26.1 OS 2.1

The Critical Areas Overlay District is designated for areas which may have limited development potential due to environmental sensitivity, including critical aquifer recharge areas, and priority wetlands. These areas should be included as primary sending areas for TDRs. These areas will be shown on the Land Use Map as a Critical Areas Overlay District.

Discussion: Under the Agricultural Lands policies, a farm owner outside of the designated TDR-Sending Area would be able to opt into the TDR program. (See Agricultural Lands Policy.)

NEED PC DIRECTION SHALL/SHOULD GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

Policy LU 26.2 OS-2.2

The Critical Areas Overlay District is limited to activities compatible with the conservation and protection of sensitive areas, including residential use, passive recreation, and agriculture, using Best Management Practices.

Policy LU 26.3 OS-2.3

Because of the sensitivity of land within the Critical Areas Overlay District, use of TDRs and other means of preservation are preferable to site development and should be implemented wherever possible.

Policy LU 26.4 OS-2.4

Properties within the Critical Areas Overlay District retain the underlying zoning, but are subject to the requirements of the Overlay District. The Overlay District is intended to encourage a pattern of development which will protect and enhance the sensitive areas. The property owner may choose one of several techniques to realize development potential on the site:

- 1) An applicant may choose to use the Flexible Lot Design Process to accommodate innovation, creativity, and design flexibility, and to achieve a level of environmental protection that would not be possible by typical lot-by-lot development, but shall not exceed the underlying base density.
- 2) An applicant may choose to transfer the development rights of the parcel to preserve the land as open space. Under this option, the development rights would be calculated assuming the development potential allowed by the zoning district.

GOAL LU-27 3

Preserve the character of the interior areas of Bainbridge Island through establishment of an Open Space Residential District.

Policy LU 27.1 OS-3.1

The Open Space Residential District is designated for less intensive, residential development and a variety of agricultural and forestry uses.

Policy LU 27.2 OS-3.2

Residential development ~~shall~~ should be compatible with the preservation of open space, forestry, agricultural activities, and natural systems. Accessory farm buildings and uses are allowable.

Policy LU 27.3 OS-3.3

The overall density for residential use ~~shall be~~ is a maximum of one unit per 2.5 acres. However, the landscape should maintain the natural and scenic qualities of the Island.

~~OS 3.4~~

~~Development of the 40 acres of City owned land located on Vincent Road (former site of the County landfill) SHALL/SHOULD be subject to a comprehensive and coordinated planning process that addresses such issues as, but is not limited to, compatibility and location of current and proposed uses, on-site circulation, off-site pedestrian connections, public amenities, landscaping, lighting and traffic. The planning process SHALL/SHOULD include a public outreach program that seeks the participation and input of both the immediate neighborhood and the larger Island wide community.~~

GOAL LU-28 4

The Residential-1 (R-1) and Residential-2 (R-2) Districts are intended to recognize an existing development pattern in the Open Space areas of the Island.

Policy LU 28.1 OS 4.1

The R-1 District is intended to recognize an existing development pattern of one unit per acre.

Policy LU 28.2 OS 4.2

The R-2 District is intended to recognize an existing development pattern of two units per acre.

Policy LU 28.3 OS 4.3

The City should consider the development of subarea plans that establish land use policies and development standards tailored to the individual communities. Neighborhood participation in development of subarea plans should be encouraged.

GOAL LU-29**Insert Islandwide Conservation Goals and Policies****GOAL LU-30 5**

Maintain and enhance the unique character of Fort Ward Planning Area (see Figure 4A) due to the history and natural landscape of the area and the sense of community that exists, including an open space system made up of wetlands, a neighborhood park, the historic marching fields, unbuildable slopes and the State Park (see Figure 4B). The Fort Ward Action Plan is a part of the Plan (Appendix XX).

OS 5.1

~~Through an LID, grants or public or private funding sources, if funding occurs, or through the use of such techniques as cluster development or transfer of development rights within the Fort Ward area:~~

- ~~1) Preserve the parade marching fields as public open space, as well as street, trail and sidewalk improvements identified in the Fort Ward Action Plan, and~~

- 2) ~~Protect and enhance the wetlands and associated buffers for a new community park which will include the natural systems from Kitsap Avenue, southwest past Belfair, as identified in the Fort Ward Action Plan.~~

~~Establish a mechanism to expedite the necessary changes to the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code to allow:~~

- 1) ~~Transfer of density from the wetland area or parade grounds to elsewhere within the Fort Ward Core Area as shown on Figure 4A.~~
- 2) ~~Replatting of the wetland area to avoid, as much as possible, development in the wetlands and buffer area and to preserve the parade grounds.~~
- 3) ~~Development of a wetland overlay master plan to include a landscape reclamation plan, planting alternatives, access, use, drainage and building envelopes.~~

~~After years of limited development, Fort Ward could be facing a dramatic increase in construction of new residential development. Many of the undeveloped lots in the Fort Ward planning area are non-conforming due to their small size. Many of these lots contain wetland or buffer area and may be developed using the Reasonable Use Exception of the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code. This policy provides mechanisms to minimize the impacts of future development on the wetlands. The parade grounds are an important historical feature of Fort Ward and a focal point of the community that also provides recreational opportunities for the residents of Fort Ward. This policy provides mechanisms to further maintain and enhance the unique character, historical value, sense of community and natural landscape of the Fort Ward Planning Area.~~

~~Policy LU 30.2 OS 5.2~~

~~In order to preserve historic structures within the Fort Ward Historic District, as shown on Fort Ward Navy Additions Map Figure 4C:~~

- 1) ~~The original density for Buildings E, 13, 18, 19, 20, 21, 46, 47, 48, 49, 50, and 51 and the existing density of Buildings B and C (10 units in total), Building 60 (12 units) and Building 65 (19 units) SHALL/SHOULD be permitted if the structure is maintained in a manner that would preserve the building's historic character and any renovation is conducted in accordance with a standard designated by the City; and~~
- 2) ~~Building 16 SHALL/SHOULD be designated as appropriate for multi-family use of up to 8 dwelling units, provided that a portion of the building is dedicated as a community meeting place.~~

~~Policy LU 30.1 OS 5.3~~

~~Where possible, create tax incentives and encourage private purchase and renovation of historic structures. Transfer density within the Fort Ward Study Area as incentives for the preservation of historic structures.~~

~~OS 5.4~~

~~Develop specific design and development guidelines that recognize the unique qualities of the Fort Ward District and respond to the scale and natural features of the lots.~~

Policy XX OS-5.5: MOVE TO HOUSING ELEMENT

Maintain housing opportunities for a range of economic levels. Provide exceptions to the design guidelines in order to meet the American with Disabilities Act while maintaining the character of the community.

Historic Preservation**GOAL LU-31-1**

Maintain and Support a Historic Preservation Program– A successful historic preservation program requires on-going support of the community, as well as the City government and its designated department.

Policy LU 31.1 HP-1.1

The City ~~shall~~ maintain its status as a Certified Local Government (CLG), thereby promoting collaboration among City departments, boards and commissions.

Policy LU 31.2 HP-1.2

The City and its HPC ~~shall-should~~ regularly review the local historic preservation ordinance and update where necessary to assure that it achieves the Comprehensive Plan's goals and policies.

Policy LU 31.3 HP-1.3

The City and the HPC ~~shall-should~~ develop the City's preferred method of project compliance review and reporting, consistent with state laws and local ordinances.

Policy LU 31.4 HP-1.4

The City and HPC ~~shall~~ coordinate with tribal communities and other interested stakeholders who have an interest in historic resources on the Island.

GOAL LU-32-2

Identification and Evaluation of Historic Resources – Historic property inventory and context statements inform planning efforts by identifying areas where resources worthy of preservation exist or are likely to occur.

Policy LU 32.1 HP-2.1

The City and HPC ~~shall~~ recognize historic resources listed on, or eligible for, the local registry as significant historic properties.

Policy LU 32.2 HP-2.2

The City and HPC ~~shall~~ continue to inventory historic resources, thereby maintaining an up-to-date site database using the latest affordable technologies available.

Policy LU 32.3 HP-2.3

The City and HPC ~~shall-should~~ continue to support and expand the Local Historic Register

NEED PC DIRECTION ~~SHALL/SOULD~~ GUIDANCE FROM PC DRAFTING SUBCOMMITTEE 6/16

program.

Policy LU 32.4 HP-2.4

The City and HPC ~~shall~~ should develop protocols for the consistent evaluation of historic resources on the Island.

Policy LU 32.5 HP-2.5

The City and HPC shall define and identify its “iconic” structures and sites (those intended for permanent preservation), which are deemed essential elements of the community’s character, history and identity.

GOAL LU-33-3

Preservation and Enhancement of Historic Resources – An effective historic preservation program provides meaningful practical incentives and policies for property owners and developers to preserve historic resources.

Policy LU 33.1 HP-3.1

The City shall encourage preservation of existing historic structures and sites as an important tool in building a sustainable and unique community.

Policy LU 33.2 HP-3.2

~~The City shall~~ Encourage the preservation, rehabilitation and restoration of existing structures through the adoption and implementation of the International Existing Building Code (IEBC).

Policy LU 33.3 HP-3.3

The City and HPC ~~SHALL~~ SHOULD collaborate with the Design Review Board to develop design guidelines for projects within or adjacent to significant historic properties and/or neighborhoods to ensure compatible development.

Policy LU 33.4 HP-3.4

~~The City and HPC shall~~ Develop guidelines to ensure review of potential direct and indirect impacts to significant historic properties when planning and/or permitting projects.

Policy LU 33.5 HP-3.5

~~The City and HPC shall~~ Identify and support practical owner/operator economic incentives and policies to encourage the rehabilitation and preservation of significant historic resources.

Policy LU 33.6 HP-3.6

~~The City shall~~ Engage in cooperative efforts with owners to encourage the preservation of historic resources.

GOAL LU-34.4

Public Participation – Establishing a broad base of support from citizens and their city government will strengthen the community’s commitment to historic preservation.

Policy LU 34.1 ~~HP 4.1~~

The City and HPC shall ~~support~~ an on-going education program to increase awareness of the historic resources on the Island.

Policy LU 34.2 ~~HP 4.2~~

The City and HPC shall ~~support~~ efforts to publicly recognize preservation efforts within the Island community.

Policy LU 34.3 ~~HP 4.3~~

The City and HPC shall ~~collaborate~~ with interested stakeholders to promote historic preservation on the Island.

Policy LU 34.4 ~~HP 4.4~~

The City and HPC shall ~~identify~~, and give public access to, an appropriate repository for curating historic preservation records and documentation.

Siting of Essential Public Facilities**GOAL LU-35.1**

The needs of the community ~~shall~~ should be met by providing essential public facilities and services that are equitably distributed throughout the community; that are located and designed to be safe and convenient to the people they serve; that provide flexibility of use and maximum efficiency; and that are compatible with adjacent uses, the environment, and preservation of public health and safety.

Discussion: The Growth Management Act requires that all jurisdictions planning under the Act must provide a process for siting essential public facilities such as airports, correctional facilities, sewage treatment plants. These goals and policies are intended to guide the siting process, and therefore, in accordance with RCW 36.70A.200(2), they do not preclude the siting of essential public facilities. Site specific consideration of a proposed essential public facility would occur during the development application review process.

Policy LU 35.1 ~~PF 1.1~~

The City ~~shall~~ should develop a list of essential public facilities of a local nature that may potentially be sited on Bainbridge Island and coordinate with the Kitsap Regional Coordinating Council in the development of a list of state and countywide public facilities.

Policy LU 35.2 ~~PF 1.2~~

When an essential public facility of a statewide or countywide nature is proposed for Kitsap County, the City ~~shall~~ should appoint representatives as members of the Facility Analysis

and Site Evaluation Advisory Committee or any other established siting committee to evaluate proposed public facility siting.

Policy LU 35.3 PF-1.3

New essential public facilities shall not be located in designated resource lands, and critical areas, ~~or other areas where the siting of such facilities would be incompatible.~~

GOAL LU-36 2

The process for siting essential public facilities ~~shall~~ should create an environment of cooperation and include adequate and early public review to promote trust between government agencies and the community.

Policy LU 36.1 PF-2.1

If an essential public facility is proposed for Bainbridge Island that is an “essential public facility,” as defined in RCW 36.70A.200, the City Mayor ~~shall~~ should create ~~appoint,~~ and the City Council confirm, a Facility Analysis and Site Evaluation Committee composed of citizens, City staff, elected officials and appropriate technical experts which ~~shall~~ should consider in determining a recommendation to City Council, at a minimum, the following:

- Analysis of the need for such facility;
- The development of specific siting criteria for the proposed project;
- Identification, analysis, and ranking of potential sites;
- Consistency with the goals and policies of the City’s Comprehensive Plan;
- Identification of potential physical impacts including, but not limited to, those relating to land use, the environment, transportation, utilities, noise, odor and public safety;
- Identification of potential cumulative impacts, including the likelihood of a related development locating in proximity to the proposed essential public facility;
- Identification of potential fiscal impacts to the local economy; and
- Measures to minimize and/or mitigate such impacts.

Policy LU 36.2 PF-2.2

The City or other government agency, if responsible for construction of an essential public facility, shall develop a community notification and communications plan that will ensure ongoing contact with the community during the planning and construction phase of a project. The plan should include identification of all departments that will play a role in the planning or construction of an essential public facility; identify other governmental regulatory requirements; identify strategies for coordinating interdepartmental and interagency activities and strategies for responding to emergency or problem situations; and identify a conflict resolution process.

EXISTING CONDITIONS

Note: this section moved to Appendix