



CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Regularly Scheduled Meeting Minutes
Monday, August 17, 2015 at 2:00 p.m.
City Council Conference Room
280 Madison Ave N
Bainbridge Island, Washington 98110

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Confirmation of Design Review Board Chair

Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2015 and June 1, 2015

Design Review Board Communication Procedures - Discussion on communication procedures.

Design Review Board Submittal Requirements - Confirm how the Design Review Board submittal requirements will be listed in the City's *Administrative Manual*

Old and New Business

Adjournment

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Alan Grainger called the meeting to order at 2:00 PM. Other DRB members in attendance were Chuck Depew, Peter Perry, Jim McNett and Susan Bergen. City Staff in attendance were Planning Director Kathy Cook and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

Confirmation of Design Review Board Chair

Chair Grainger asked whether there were any objections to his continuing as chair of the Design Review Board. There were none.

Motion: I move Alan Grainger remain as chair.

Perry/McNett – Passed Unanimously 5-0

Approval of Minutes – May 18, 2015 and June 1, 2015

Minutes approved unanimously 5-0.

Mr. Perry asked for an overview of the Design Review Board's (DRB) job. Mr. Grainger stated the DRB was an advising body to the Planning Director, Planning Commission and Hearing Examiner. The difference between single family homes and subdivisions versus condominiums were mentioned. Relationships to the Planning Commission and Hearing Examiner were discussed. The question of whether in the past the DRB had spoken directly to the Planning Commission and Hearing Examiner was brought up and the answer was yes, when the DRB felt it was important.

Design Review Board Communication Procedures - Discussion on communication procedures

Director Cook gave a reminder about the correct process for communicating between the DRB members stressing that ANY communication regarding projects was not allowed. The question of what to do with the old e-mails from before the COBI E-mail addresses was broached. Ms. Rasely stated she would check into that and report back to the members. (An e-mail was sent to all current DRB members on 9/15/15. See attached copy.)

Design Review Board Submittal Requirements - Confirm how the Design Review Board submittal requirements will be listed in the City's *Administrative Manual*

Director Cook reviewed that a year ago the DRB members did not feel they were getting enough information to review projects and gave staff a wish list of what they would like to see. Those wish list items were incorporated into two handouts given to applicants as design items they were encouraged to provide for DRB review, but the items were not actually required. Director Cook felt the information had been well-received by applicants.

In September, the Planning Department would be asking for codification of their requests so as to require applicants to supply the information and wanted to clarify with the DRB the items they felt were absolutely necessary. Mr. Grainger asked for the ground floor use plan to be required (#7 on the guideline list). He also wanted staff to be aware that a preliminary schematic did not have to be a CAD drawing but could be a hand drawn plan. Discussion of the word "use" resulted in the word being struck from 7 with the phrase "preliminary ground floor plan" used instead.

Mr. McNett requested C, D, E and F be required. He also felt 8A was not unusual to ask for and should be required. Mr. Grainger stated they could not do 9A if they do not do 8B. Mr. McNett also asked for the elevations to require color and material selections as well. Mr. Grainger stated it did not have to be super specific, just a basic representative of what the developer had in mind. Mr. Depew stated they really needed to see a preliminary set of information that was parallel to the final information presented. The term "Preliminary Concept Plan" was suggested as a way to describe the information they would like.

Ms. Bergen commented that the final landscape plan (5B) should have "tree(s)" instead of "tree."

Old and New Business

Ericksen Ave Design Overlay

Mr. McNett stated that at a future meeting Jon Thornburgh would be coming to speak about the Ericksen Avenue Guidelines as a representative of one of the owners in the Ericksen Avenue Overlay District who has an upcoming project there would present why he feels the City should look at the Ericksen Avenue Guidelines differently. Mr. McNett mentioned that he first heard this presentation at a meeting of the Historic Preservation Commission. He also wanted guidance on whether he need to recuse himself from any discussion ensuing from the presentation.

Ms. Cook gave a review of how the Ericksen Avenue Design Guidelines came about. The Design Review Board volunteered their time to develop the guidelines during the Winslow Tomorrow project process. Once the new Core District Guidelines were redeveloped, they moved on to the Ericksen Avenue Guidelines. Discussion continued about whether the City should be more flexible and whether or not the Historic Preservation Commission should do a review before the project goes to the DRB.

The question of whether Mr. McNett would have to recuse himself from any future projects on Ericksen Ave from Jon Thornburgh. Ms. Cook stated he would just have to state at the beginning of an Ericksen Avenue review that he would need to disclose at the beginning that you were involved in the Design Guideline development but feel you could make an unbiased decision and did any of the DRB members object to his input.

Mr. Perry brought up parking and wanted to know if there was anything going on in the City with parking. Mr. Grainger mentioned that planning regulations take into account patrons of businesses, but do not account for staffing needed to serve the patrons. Conversation continued with ADA parking and no proper review for meeting ADA requirements. Director Cook stated the Building Official review looks for compliance with ADA regulations. Lynwood Center and Rolling Bay were also brought up as future parking problems because both neighborhood service centers rely on empty

lots for parking. The question of where that parking would exist if/when those empty lots were developed was brought up. Parks in the midst of a city setting were canvassed and how a park could evolve without the ability to add parking. The restrictions on Waterfront Park due to its RCO grant were canvassed. Mr. Perry asked to whom and how the DRB could make a recommendation that the City perform a parking study looking at the big picture of parking in the City. Mr. Depew felt a study was not needed, an implementation plan was needed. Mr. Grainger spoke about the building going on in Seattle and the small amount of parking for which there is no requirement. Mr. Perry thought it might be wise to have the Non-Motorized Transportation Committee weigh in on their needs for a development project.

Tree Ad Hoc Committee Update

Mr. Perry gave an update as to what the Tree Ad Hoc Committee had been working on (commercial and buffer regulations) citing residential development as the problem in cutting down trees as opposed to commercial development. He felt there should be a lifetime limit to the percentage of trees a property owner can take down as opposed to a residential lot being allowed to take down 6 trees per year. He felt the big problem with the Tree Ad Hoc Committee was the lack of an arborist or landscape specialists to represent the different capacities of trees besides being a tree unit. There was a general discussion about inviting members of other City Committees to a DRB meeting to exchange information about what they would be looking for and canvas how to strategically work together. Mr. Grainger asked that Ms. Rasely keep that idea in mind when there were not any projects for review. Instead of canceling a meeting, invite another committee to visit and share vision, etc., with the DRB.

Adjournment

Meeting was adjourned at 3:49 PM.

Approved by:


Alan Grainger, Chair
9/21/2015


Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

Jane Rasely

From: Jane Rasely
Sent: Tuesday, September 15, 2015 9:19 AM
To: Alan Grainger; Chuck Depew; Jim McNett; Kathy Cook; Peter Perry; Susan Bergen
Subject: Old E-mail from Before COBI Committee E-mail Addresses

Good Morning,

This is your follow-up information regarding what to do with old e-mails received before you were assigned a COBI Committee e-mail address. (We discussed this at the last DRB meeting.)

According to Steve Miller, IF you have e-mails with substance, i.e., discussing more than just a meeting time or some such housekeeping issue, the e-mail should be forwarded to your current COBI Committee e-mail address for retention purposes. If you have e-mail that say, for example, "The DRB meeting scheduled for September 7 has been cancelled due to the holiday," that can be deleted. If you have an e-mail such as the one recently forwarded to you through my e-mail but with information from Jim McNett, that should be forwarded to your COBI Committee e-mail account.

This policy should only apply to those of you who were DRB members before the COBI Committee e-mail accounts were created. Peter and Susan do not have to worry about this. Chuck, I am not quite sure when you joined the DRB, so this may or may not apply to you. Alan and Jim, this definitely applies to both of you.

I understand this is a somewhat clunky transition however, it is legally necessary. Please let me know if you have any further questions or concerns.

Thank you,

Jane Rasely
Administrative Specialist, Planning and Community Development
City of Bainbridge Island
280 Madison Ave N
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110
(206) 780-3758
jrasely@bainbridgewa.gov



PLEASE PRINT

Join ListServ Yes/No

[illegible]