



CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD **Regularly Scheduled Meeting** **Monday, July 6, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.**



Location:
Bainbridge Island City Hall
City Council Conference Room
280 Madison Avenue North
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

AGENDA

- 2:00 p.m. Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)**
- 2:00 – 2:15 p.m. Approval of Minutes**
May 18, 2015 and June 1, 2015 Meetings
- 2:15 – 2:45 p.m. Design Review Board Review and Communication Procedures**
Staff: Kathy Cook – Director of Planning & Community Development
Discussion on review and communication procedures.
- 2:45 – 3:15 p.m. Design Review Board Submittal Requirements**
Staff: Kathy Cook – Director of Planning & Community Development
Confirm how the Design Review Board submittal requirements will be listed
in the City's *Administrative Manual*.
- 3:15 – 3:45 p.m. Ericksen Avenue Design Guidelines Discussion**
- 3:45 p.m. Old and New Business**
- 4:00 p.m. Adjournment**

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



CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
Monday, May 18, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.
City Council Conference Room
280 Madison Ave N
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Approval of Minutes – May 4, 2015 Meeting

Pleasant Beach Village Homes PLN13880D PRE – Continued discussion of parking and landscaping

Rolling Bay Land Company/Cole PLN50184 PRE Pre-application – Review with applicant

Old and New Business

Adjournment

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

The Design Review Board meeting was called to order at 2:05 PM by Chair Mark Levine. Other DRB members present were Chuck Depew, Alan Grainger, and Jim McNett. Adrian Sawyer and Peter Perry were absent. City Staff present were Planner Scott Speer and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

Approval of Minutes – May 4, 2015 Meeting

Chuck Depew moved to accept the minutes. Jim McNett seconded the motion. Minutes were unanimously approved.

Pleasant Beach Village Homes PLN13880D PRE – Continued discussion of parking and landscaping

A brief discussion was had to determine that everyone had received the site plans from this project. Mark asked Charlie Wenzlau to walk them through this week's submission. Charlie described the initial ideas for landscaping around the duplexes and homes. Chuck asked if the landscaping would be the interior from the street. Charlie stated there would 4.5 feet of landscaping between the sidewalk and the buildings with a 5 foot sidewalk. Chuck asked about the terracing and paths between the homes. Alan asked about the stairs that lead to the front door of each home and taking each individual staircase and combining them and then splitting them at a certain point to lead to each door thereby allowing for more landscaping. Mark and the other board members thanked Charlie for providing the landscaping plans so they had a way to get into what the overall picture for the project was. They stood behind their recommendation.

Rolling Bay Land Company/Cole PLN50184 PRE Pre-application – Review with applicant

Scott Speer gave an overview of the Rolling Bay project. He described the mixed use development on Sunrise Drive as some commercial space with a market, restaurant and office space containing other retail and

residential buildings. Mark asked if there were any areas of concern. Scott replied he did not think so and that the developer was trying to go above and beyond the necessary items. For example, they were above their required tree count, etc. Questions about the septic system were answered. Alan asked about the access and utility easement and whether it was public. Scott stated it was an easement that could provide access to the lot north of this development. There were no utilities in the parcel at this time. Chuck asked about the setback; Scott stated it was 10 feet required and 15 feet average. Mark asked about the buffer by the Jiffy Mart and whether they could go back and ask the owner to continue the buffer that would be in place in the new development. Alan mentioned that placement of the garbage and recycling is not very sensitive to the adjacent single family residence (SFR). Chuck asked about shoulder improvements. Scott informed him that the developer had agreed to make shoulder improvements, but the details had not yet been worked out with Public Works. Parking was discussed. Alan mentioned the plans show a two way bicycle lane. Scott stated he felt they meant to show a one way bike lane. It was mentioned that the bike lane looks like a parking space and that this development had a chance to set precedence and really define bike lanes in this area. Chuck brought up ADA accessibility and that only one space met the requirements because the vehicle entry/exit point was placed on the wrong side for one of the spots. It was further discussed that for 2 wheelchairs to pass each other, they need 6 feet and it was unfortunate that we (as a City) seem to have set a standard for 5 foot wide sidewalks.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Asked about the buffer and wondered why there were buffers between two neighborhood service centers. He felt it was probably too late for this project, but another committee was questioning why the buffer would exist between the two areas. He stated he wanted the DRB to be aware of the other committee's conversation.

Mark asked whether Scott had any other comments to make about the project as a whole. Scott felt that overall the developer was trying to be above board with this project and create something nice looking. They like the idea of getting some more development going in this area. Mark felt this was a lovely but delicate area that had potential for growth with character.

Rob Conoley, Citizen – A long-time resident of the area spoke about parking and how it moves about depending upon the day of the week and the events occurring at any one time. He stated there was a cloud of about 25-30 ghost cars that drift around the area. He felt this project would create an acute moment where people are running across the street for their lives to go to the post office and no one looks to see if there are any cars coming. He would like to see the north side of Valley Road become a plaza of some sort especially since this project would bring more traffic in.

Alan asked about step out from curb parking and wondered about the garbage/recycling not being shown on the landscape plan.

Developers were invited in at 2:49 PM and introduced themselves to the DRB. Russ Hamlet, Brandon Hogg, Kristin Easterbrook, Kia Miko and Lisa Martin. Lisa Martin introduced their project and her interest as a living green project and that they are trying to bring attractive and green amenities to the neighborhood. Chuck asked if the Friends of Rolling Bay were in favor of the project. Kristin Easterbrook stated the developers had been trying to take into account information gleaned from a neighborhood meeting a year ago and that the Friends of

Rolling Bay would be receiving more information on the project as the public did. Brandon offered a general overview of the project. He described the different components of the site plan, including the fact that the interior courtyard had a southern exposure to provide outdoor seating for the restaurant as well as a neighborhood gathering place. Mark asked why they were developing the parcel this way. Brandon replied it was a mixed-use zone but the key factor was that people in the neighborhood wanted a place to gather.

Discussion continued with the possibility of changing the access to the space to the northern side of the lot and sliding the buildings further south to create a more aesthetic view for the courtyard. The DRB was concerned about the “workings” of the businesses being too close to the SFR and the amount of space needed for delivery and garbage trucks. They felt having the access on the northern side would eliminate those issues. Chuck mentioned the width of the sidewalk would be better at 6 feet and since they would be setting the standard as the first project in the area, they could make that happen. Alan spoke about bumping the curb out right to the bicycle lane to prevent cars parking in the bike lane.

Material, colors and branding were all spoken of and some of the inspiration for the character of the barn style building was shown. Lighting was discussed and it was again mentioned that this project would set the tone/standard for this neighborhood service center. Alan asked Scott if he knew how much space needed to exist between two private drives. Chuck asked if they had a plan for getting to LEED certification.

Landscaping was presented by Kia Miko. She described permeable pavers, a water feature, possible rain garden and mowable lawns. They planned to replace some of the orchard trees that are past their production prime and add blueberry bushes that would all be open to harvest from the public. Full screen buffering was described as well as a large rain garden on the south edge of the reserve drain field.

Mark brought up the traffic study and Alan asked if Scott could have the parking study include how far apart two private roads would have to be and if 45-50 feet would be enough space. Russ mentioned that he thought the City would be okay with the northern entrance instead of the southern entrance. Alan double checked that they didn't have to make a recommendation today, so it would be okay for Mark to leave and lose the DRB quorum.

Rob Conoley, Citizen – Mentioned parking should have some flex to it so when tour buses come there is a place for them to park and stated the church does not like their large parking lot being used for that. He also told about a break-in the church had after dark and hoped this development would have good lighting and that the police do not come to Rolling Bay after dark either. Jim McNett mentioned that there will be four residential units there which will help with the security after dark.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Stated that having the building on the northern portion of the lot guarantees the southern exposure even if a large building is put in to the south of the development. Mr. Schmid went on to discuss that with the comprehensive plan update going on, this would be a good time for people to get involved with discussing not only what the guidelines should be, but what the ordinances would be. He mentioned the noise from a restaurant and stated if the restaurant was put on the corner, there would be less noise close to the SFR.

Jim McNett felt for a pre-app, their presentation fulfilled all the DRB's desires for information. Alan agreed and complimented the developers for making their job easier.

Old and New Business

Jim brought up the memo about changing verbiage from should to shall on the Ericksen Ave Guidelines from Planning Director Kathy Cook. He mentioned the Thornburghs sent him a thoughtful memo he would like to disseminate to the DRB. He said they had come up with a list of reasons to encourage saving historic buildings.

Discussion of the use of should or shall in the Ericksen Avenue Guidelines continued with Mr. Schmid stating that his own feeling was that they (Council) talked about it once and then the mistake happened when they approved it. He continued saying the Planning Commission also had concerns about it. Alan said they were calling it a clerical error. They agreed it would be on the June 1 meeting agenda.

Alan mentioned he may not be able to attend the June 1 meeting and he would let everyone know that morning if he would be there.

Jim McNett asked Mr. Schmid about the memorial he was working on and whether or not he has researched bronze memorials and putting a picture of the lady on it. Mr. Schmid stated he had researched bronze memorials and he was as yet undecided as whether her picture would be on it.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 4:12 PM.

Approved by:

Alan Grainger, Chair (for Mark Levine)

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist



CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
Monday, June 1, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.
City Council Conference Room
280 Madison Ave N
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Bainbridge Island Rowing Club PLN50155SPR Site Plan Review
Virginia Mason Clinic Pre Pre-application
Old and New Business
Adjournment

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Mark Levine called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM. Other Design Review Board members in attendance were Adrian Sawyer, Chuck Depew, Jim McNett, Peter Perry and Alan Grainger. City staff present were Senior Planner Heather Beckmann and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

Bainbridge Island Rowing Club PLN50155SPR Site Plan Review

Mark opened discussion with Senior Planner Heather Beckmann giving an overview on the BI. Rowing Club. She stated the proposal had not changed since the last meeting. She mentioned the Waterfront Park project was moving along and should be going to Council soon. The Rowing Club project will be moving along at a parallel pace. The Board was informed that Sue Barrington from the Community Center had met with Kathy Cook and that everyone was onboard about communicating during community events. Mark had two questions: 1) The developer kept referring to the tennis courts as the "Courtyard." Heather stated that space was not theirs. The Rowing Club lease did not include that space. Alan asked if the park development plan did not go through, would the tennis courts remain. Heather and Mark both stated the courts would remain if the Waterfront Park project was not approved. 2) Mark wondered why there was not any exterior lighting planned. Chuck mentioned at the least they must provide lighting for the pedestrian entrances.

Chuck brought up the lack of a traffic study for a project that will impact traffic so much. Jim asked how the parking was functioning now. Heather spoke about the possibility of changing the drop off point to Bjune in order to keep circulation on Brien. Mark stated again that the City needs to do a comprehensive parking study and not just keep approving projects without an overall parking plan. He requested the City complete a parking study. Heather mentioned there are individual studies being done and that Doug and the Downtown Association are working on the issue. Alan suggested the studies all be combined. Talk then turned to building a parking garage on the lower gravel parking lot between City Hall and Marche'. Chuck spoke extensively about that option as he had previously helped develop the study for that.

The BI Rowing Club was invited in at 2:22 PM. Introductions were made around the table. Bruce Anderson began by briefing the DRB on updates since the last meeting. He offered up a short description of the overall project stating the overwhelming concern voiced at their public meeting was about drop off and parking. They

continue to count vehicles and study the situation in an informal way. Mark asked for a “day in the life” synopsis of the Rowing Club and the capacity of the multi-purpose room. Bruce Anderson stated it depended on the use, but there should be room for 125 seated at tables. Tim said the kitchen would be a catering kitchen only since they did not really know how the community might use the space. Alan asked why they have not provided a paved surface on the east side to accommodate food entrance to the kitchen. Bruce stated they would have some paved area from the east entrance, but as the secondary builders behind the City, they will coordinate with them. Chuck asked about how they would phase the project if they were unable to fund the entire project. Tim described the possibility of building just the ground floor and leaving the second floor for a later date.

Mark asked about the lighting plan. Bruce stated their lighting plan showed how the site would like when lit at night. Jim asked when they planned to start building. Tim stated they had to get through the City’s approval process before they would receive maximum funding from their donators, but they had five years from the date of signing the lease so they have to break ground by 2019.

Alan asked about the south elevation not matching on all the plans. Talk continued with a discussion about keeping as many trees as possible as well as trees that had been removed due to disease. Mark asked about garbage receptacles. Tim stated they will be inside as will the water spigots. The bathrooms will have electric dryers instead of paper towels. The question of air conditioning was asked. Bruce stated they were going to ventilate instead.

**Motion was made to approve the drawings as submitted.
Grainger/Perry – Passed unanimously.**

Discussion resumed of parking with the idea that the Virginia Mason project might be conducive to creating a parking garage in the lower gravel lot.

Virginia Mason representatives were invited in at 3:05 PM.

Virginia Mason Clinic Pre Pre-application

An overview of the proposed 20,000 square foot building was given including a description of how the parking and outdoor areas would be developed. Site plans were displayed and a desire to retain significant trees was expressed. Design sketches were shared showing elevations from all directions. Proposed materials were grey/black slate shingles, metal and concrete. Jim asked if the developers had spoken with the Historical Museum about what they are proposing. They had not. He was concerned about the MRI trucks being pushed right up next to the museum. Discussion continued with parking. Alan complimented the developer on their light touch and in accommodating circulation of all types. Jim was concerned about the “box-like” look. He was hoping to alleviate that with a courtyard or something that would soften the edge. Chuck would have liked to see the gables wrap around the corners. Perry asked about softening the edge with a green wall since there was not a lot of room around the walkway. The second floor setback was proposed as an area that could provide a green area with arbors and vegetation.

Old and New Business

Jim brought up the Ericksen Avenue Design Guidelines and that he would like to have a few minutes at the next meeting to discuss them. Jane agreed she would make sure the topic was on the agenda for the next meeting. Alan stated it seemed like the topic may become contentious. His concern was that regardless of what is there now, someone in the future might not be as sensitive as the current owners and may just want to maximize their profit potential if the shall is not there. Jim responded saying that was exactly why the Board should have the discussion.

Peter spoke about the Tree Ad Hoc Committee and Ordinance 2015-04, Vegetation Screening. He thought it would be great if the ordinances could all be in one area instead of spread out over multiple chapters of the municipal code and would like to advocate that the Tree Ad Hoc Committee speak with the DRB about how their findings would influence the types of decisions the DRB makes about vegetation and trees. He wondered why the Planning Commission and DRB do not speak to each other since they are both trying to do the same thing.

Charles Schmid, Citizen – Stated the Ordinance that came in front of the Planning Commission was still in flux. The Tree Ad Hoc Committee was also still working on the Ordinance. They are working on making good changes a little at a time in order to get changes begun.

Mark felt that all the commissions and committees should come together and find a common ground and work to get some things done. Chuck stated the key was the DRB existed to interpret the regulations, not to be a part of creating the regulations. Mark and Jim felt that was his interpretation and that the City asked them to do so when it was good for the City. Alan felt that what Mark proposed was a heavy handed approach and it would be better to have one person from each committee serve as a subcommittee. It was suggested that Peter Perry attend the next Tree Ad Hoc Committee and ask for a voice on that committee.

Mr. Schmid asked if the DRB had been invited to the “branding” meeting the City was holding. He felt the DRB should be involved with the design of that.

Chuck stated he would not be able to attend the June 15 DRB meeting. He also thought the DRB should be offering insight into the new Police/Court building. He felt they should offer advice on the design options earlier rather than later.

Jim was excited about the Waterfront Park plan. He felt there were a few small things that needed to be moved around, but he felt they had made an impact on the project. Mr. Schmid was disappointed they would be taking down a Sequoia and plum tree to build.

Adrian mentioned his term was up at the end of June and he will apply to renew his appointment. Mark requested everyone look for a seventh DRB member.

Meeting was adjourned at 4:29 PM.

Approved by:

Alan Grainger, Chair (for Mark Levine)

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

City of Bainbridge Island
PLANNING & COMMUNITY DEVELOPMENT



MEMORANDUM

TO: Design Review Board

FROM: Kathy Cook
Planning Director

DATE: June 30, 2015

RE: Finalizing DRB Submittal Requirements

Last year the DRB worked with staff to clarify the submittal requirements for pre-application site plan review and final site plan review. At that time, the DRB wished to expand the requirements to include additional items that were not specified in the code. Staff explained that if they were not in the code, the DRB could request that an applicant provide them voluntarily, but not require them. The DRB and staff then developed a submittal list (attached) that included required items and items that were optional, but strongly recommended. In explaining the submittal list to applicants, staff has been encouraging them to provide the optional items in order to assist the DRB in its review.

The staff is now updating the department's submittal requirements to include new shoreline and tree preservation regulations, and we would like to use this opportunity to incorporate revisions to the DRB submittal requirements. The revised submittal requirements will be reviewed and adopted by Council in August.

At the DRB meeting on July 6, I would like to discuss whether the DRB wishes to keep the list as is, or convert some of the optional items to required items, keeping in mind that if they are listed as requirements, they will become mandatory elements for all projects, regardless of project size or scope.

Thank you, and I look forward to our discussion.

PRE-APPLICATION SITE PLAN REVIEW

Revised November 2014

The Design Review Board's Pre-application Site Plan Review is composed of preliminary, not final, exhibits and is scheduled by the planner after the Planning Department's pre-application meeting. When the planner determines the required submittals are complete, he will assign a date for the Design Review Board's Pre-application Site Plan Review. The purpose of the pre-application site plan review is to review a proposed project for compliance with applicable design guidelines, and to provide the applicant with guidance as to what revisions are needed.

The planner ensures each DRB member receives the complete 11x17 packet and/or an electronic copy (pdf) of exhibits 5 working days before the scheduled meetings for the Pre-application and Final Site Plan Reviews. The DRB's comments and recommendations are based on how the exhibits and drawings incorporate or interpret the design guidelines. The applicant will present the project using appropriate size graphics for the whole Board to see, either on minimum 24 x 36 boards or using a projector and screen.

*The following list of Drawings/Exhibits for the Pre-application Site Plan Review include submittals that are required for the DRB's review, as well as items that are optional, but strongly recommended. The purpose of these submittal requirements is to help the DRB fully understand a development proposal and how it conforms to the City's design guidelines. Providing this information will result in a speedier review process and avoid multiple meetings. **Required submittal items are indicated in bold face**; optional but strongly recommended items are so indicated:*

1. **Project Vision Summary**
2. Preliminary Proposal Information includes:
 - a. **Preliminary estimates of square footage provided/allowed for commercial space and/or residential units.**
 - b. **Preliminary estimates of landscape area provided/required.**
 - c. **Preliminary estimates of parking spaces provided/required.**
3. Preliminary Context Analysis includes:
 - a. **Aerial photo (Google Earth Image is sufficient) and streetscape photos with streets and site boundaries indicated.**
 - b. **Vicinity map showing existing conditions.**
4. Preliminary Composite Site Plan which includes:
 - a. **Preliminary roadways, parking areas, vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site.**
 - b. **Preliminary footprint of new structures and their proposed entrances.**
 - c. Preliminary location and description of mechanical, accessory or trash structures on site. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - d. Location of adjacent buildings and features located on the site perimeter. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - e. Preliminary locations of entrances, outdoor areas, and vehicular access to the structure. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - f. Preliminary building locations, courtyards, setbacks. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*

5. Preliminary Composite Landscape Plan which includes:
 - a. **Preliminary plan showing location of walkways, gardens, terraces and landscaped areas.**
 - b. **Preliminary identification and discussion of tree and plant retention program for site.**
 - c. **Preliminary identification and discussion of plant and hardscape material selections.**
 - d. **Preliminary identification of protected critical areas.**
6. Conceptual Drainage Plan (**OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*)
7. Preliminary Floor Plan(s) includes:
 - a. Preliminary ground floor/ entrance plan(s), showing the ground floor uses. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
8. Preliminary Sections include:
 - a. Preliminary transverse and longitudinal site sections extending to adjacent buildings within 100 feet of the property line. (These sections can include the “b” section that follows.) **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - b. Preliminary section through the most critical area of the structure(s) with property lines, preliminary floor to floor heights, overall height, and spot elevations noted. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
9. Preliminary Elevations include:
 - a. **Preliminary main elevations of each structure and of adjacent structures in context.**
 - b. Preliminary identification and discussion of material and color selections. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - c. Preliminary identification and discussion of mechanical screens and venting locations. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
10. Preliminary Renderings can include:
 - a. Preliminary eye level perspective from major street location. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - b. Preliminary aerial perspective depicting entire project and adjacent buildings in context. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
11. Preliminary Exterior Lighting Plan includes preliminary location of exterior lights and indication of light spillage at night. Preliminary lighting can be included in the composite site plan and elevations and doesn’t require a separate sheet. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*

FINAL SITE PLAN REVIEW

Revised November 2014

The Final Site Plan Review is the last review by the DRB. It is presented after incorporating the recommendations from the Pre-application Site Plan Review and can include other refinements that have occurred to the design. When the planner determines the required exhibits are complete, he will assign a date for the Final Site Plan Review. The purpose of the final site plan review is to review a proposed project for compliance with applicable design guidelines, and to ensure that the project reflects any revisions recommended by the DRB at the pre-application site plan review.

*The planner ensures each DRB member receives the complete 11x17 packet and an electronic copy (pdf) of exhibits 5 working days before the scheduled meeting for the Final Site Plan Review. The DRB comments and recommendations are based on how the exhibits and drawings incorporate or interpret the design guidelines. The applicant will present the project using appropriate size graphics for the whole Board to see, either on minimum 24 x 36 boards or using a projector and screen. **Required submittal items are indicated in bold face**; optional but strongly recommended items are so indicated:*

1. **Final Project Vision Summary, incorporating DRB pre-application comments,**
2. **Final Proposal Information includes:**
 - a. Survey of site.
 - b. **Final square footage provided/allowed for commercial space and/or residential units.**
 - c. **Final landscape area provided/required.**
 - d. **Final parking spaces provided/required.**
3. **Final Context Analysis includes:**
 - a. **Aerial photo (Google Earth Image is sufficient) and streetscape photos with streets and site boundaries indicated.**
 - b. **Vicinity map showing existing conditions including adjacent structures, uses and zoning.**
4. **Final Composite Site Plan includes:**
 - a. **All streets and property lines with dimensions and required setbacks.**
 - b. **Final roadways, parking areas, vehicular and pedestrian circulation on the site.**
 - c. **Final roof plan of new structures and their proposed entrances.**
 - d. **Final location and description of mechanical, accessory or trash structures on site.**
 - e. **Location of adjacent buildings and features located on the site perimeter.**
 - f. **Significant existing trees that are to be saved on the site and basic landscape features.**
5. **Final Composite Landscape Plan Includes:**
 - a. **Final design for ground plane and all walkways, roof gardens, terraces or landscaped areas.**
 - b. **Final selection of existing trees and plants incorporated into the landscape design.**
 - c. **Final selection of plants and notes such as species, size and images of specified plants.**
6. **Final Floor Plan (s) includes:**
 - a. **Final Plans showing uses for all floors.**
 - b. **Final design for all entrances, outdoor areas, and vehicular access to the structure.**

7. Final Sections includes:
 - a. Final transverse and longitudinal sections through the entire site extending 100 feet past the property line to adjacent buildings or buildings across a roadway. (These sections can include the “b” sections that follow.) **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - b. Final transverse and longitudinal sections through each structure with property lines, floor to floor heights, overall height, and spot elevations noted. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
8. Final Elevations include:
 - a. **Final elevations of each structure including exterior mechanical screens, venting locations and adjacent structures in context.**
 - b. **Final material board and color notes as needed for clarification.**
 - c. Scale figures and transparent street trees or planned landscaping. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - d. Shadows should clarify modulation. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - e. Final design for building modulation with dimensions.
9. Final Renderings include:
 - a. Eye level perspective renderings from two opposite street locations. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
 - b. At least one depicting entire project with adjacent buildings in context. **OPTIONAL, BUT STRONGLY RECOMMENDED.*
10. **Final Exterior Lighting Plan includes:**
 - a. **Final location of exterior lights and indication of light spillage at night.**
 - b. **Description, images, color and finish of selected fixtures.**
11. **Any other graphics requested during the Preliminary Site Plan Review.**