



CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Monday, September 21, 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 – 2:10 p.m. | Approval of Minutes
August 17, 2015 meeting |
| 2:10 – 2:55 p.m. | Discussion with City Attorney: Public Records / Public Meetings
Lisa Marshall – City Attorney |
| 2:55 – 3:55 p.m. | Board Discussion of the Ericksen Avenue Design Guidelines
Piper and Jon Thornburg – Guest Speakers |
| 3:55 – 4:20 p.m. | Board Discussion on Enhancing Design Review Board Processes and Interfacing with Other Committees |
| 4:20 – 4:30 p.m. | Old and New Business |
| 4:30 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, 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

Jane Rasely, Administrative Specialist

THE OPEN PUBLIC MEETINGS ACT



City of Bainbridge Island

What Groups are Covered?

- “Governing body”... the multimember board, commission, committee, council, or other policy or rule-making body of a public agency....
- Applies to committees, commissions, and boards which conducts hearings, takes testimony, or public comment..
- The municipal code requires that all committee, commission and board meetings be open to the public - BIMC 2.34.040

What is a “Meeting”?

- “Meeting” means the gathering of a quorum at which “action” is taken.
- “Action” means the transaction of official business of a public agency.
- “Action” includes deliberations, discussions, as well as “final actions.”
- Purely social gatherings, travel, etc., not included IF city business is not discussed.
- Be careful of virtual meetings by email.

“Regular” Meetings

- A “Regular” meeting is one that is held according to a schedule adopted by ordinance, resolution, order, or rule.
- NEW!!! Regular meeting agendas must be made available online at least 24 hours in advance of the meeting. Doesn't apply if the governing body doesn't have a website or has fewer than 10 full-time employees.
- The governing body can conduct any business at a regular meeting.

“Special” Meetings

- A “Special” meeting is any meeting that is not a regular meeting.
- Notice of time, place, business is required:
 - ❖ To members of the governing body (unless waived)
 - ❖ To news organizations who have filed written requests
- Final action is allowed only on items listed in the notice.

“Executive Sessions”

Allowable Subjects

- Matters of national security
- Terms of real estate deals
- Reviewing complaints/charges against a public official or employee
- Evaluating applicants for public employment and reviewing performance of employees
- Legal advice on pending, potential litigation and legal risks

“Executive Sessions”

Process

- Must announce the purpose.
- Must announce the time it will end.
- May exclude any person not needed for the purpose.
- No final action may be taken in executive session.

Exempt Meetings

- Deliberations on “quasi-judicial” matters (such as disciplinary appeals.)
- Collective bargaining strategies.
- No notice or other restrictions for exempt gatherings.

Things to “Take Away”

- The City Council is a “governing body.”
- Business discussions, even emails, can be “meetings” governed by the law.
- Particular notice needed for special meetings.
- Executive sessions: limited purposes, no final actions.
- Deliberations on appeals are exempt.

OVERVIEW
OF THE
PUBLIC RECORDS ACT
RCW 42.56

City of Bainbridge Island

Public Records Act (PRA)

- Adopted by voters in 1972 as part of the “Public Disclosure Act.”
- In 2006 the public records parts were separated from the campaign/lobbying disclosure parts and moved to RCW 42.56 and renamed the “Public Records Act.”
- The Act is often still referred to as “Washington Public Disclosure Act” or “State Freedom of Information Act.”

The Law Favors Disclosure

- If not specifically exempt, records get disclosed.
- Courts have narrowly defined the exemptions and construed the Act in favor of disclosure.
- *“Courts shall take into account the policy of this [Act] that free and open examination of public records is in the public interest, even though such examination may cause inconvenience or embarrassment to public officials or others.”* RCW 42.56.550(3).

Why do we have the PRA?

“The people of this state do not yield their sovereignty to the agencies that serve them. The people, in delegating authority, do not give their public servants the right to decide what is good for the people to know and what is not good for them to know.” *RCW 42.56.030*

First, a “cautionary tale...”



Obtained by Puyallup Herald, published widely in August 2010

From: Matt Richardson [mailto:mrichardson@ci.sumner.wa.us]

Sent: Friday, May 02, 2008 3:34 PM

To: ***** *****

Subject: RE: Hey there

Tuesday after 6 would be best, and yes this is secure. And no it's all blown over now. Things are not very good on that end though, very lonely in some ways. So, although this is city email and is subject to open records requests for abuse of city equipment or campaigning from city e-mail, conversations about business are good here. Personal things like meeting me at the Seattle Westin room 1708 on May 10 at 3, could be broken down to SWR1708-5/10-3 lol

I would change your passwords tonight to something really strange, just in case.

Talk to you next week,

M

PS delete this message :)

What is a Public Record?

- a “writing”
- relating to the “conduct of government”
- “prepared, owned, used or retained” by an agency

“Relating to Conduct of Government”

- In the end, almost all City records will relate to the conduct of government.
- A **personal** record on a City computer may not relate to government, but the existence of the document may be a public record. (e.g., purely personal e-mail sent from City computer or City email account)

“Relating to Conduct of Government”

- E-mails discussing City business sent from private computers and private email addresses constitute public records
- Phone logs, text messages, and emails concerning City business sent from your **personal cell phone** constitute public records
 - Nissen v. Pierce County, No. 44852-1-II, September 4, 2014: County Prosecuting Attorney failed to produce phone logs and text messages sent from his personal cell phone.

Why use the City email address provided to you?

first.last@cobicommittee.email

- Saves you time:
 - When responding to a PDA request, your city-related emails are in one place and you don't have to rummage through your personal email account to find them

Why use the City email address provided to you? first.last@cobicommittee.email

- Complies with legally-mandated retention schedules.
 - Retention schedules differ depending upon subject-matter. If personal email is used, you will have to comply by keeping the email for the designated length of time. Tedious. Onerous.
 - If you have emails concerning City business in your personal email account, forward them to your City email address. You won't then have to worry about the appropriate retention schedule.

Why use the City email address ? **first.last@cobicommittee.email**

- Records retention schedules are located in
 - RCW 40.14
 - WAC 434-630
 - WAC 464-635
 - WAC 464-635
 - WAC 464-640
 - WAC 464-660
 - WAC 464-662
- Retention is by subject matter/category; the Washington State Archivist's table enumerating the above requirements is 36 pages long.

Why use the City email address provided to you?

first.last@cobicommittee.email

- Protects your privacy:
 - A PRA lawsuit filed in superior court will result in an order to produce City business-related emails sent from your private e-mail address. Failure to provide the ordered emails will result in a court order to produce your hard drive. The court will then review all personal emails to locate the City business-related emails.
 - Deleted emails can be found using forensic e-mail analysis.

“Prepared, Owned, Used, Retained”

A document may be a public record *even if not in the City's hands.*

Examples:

- The City reviews technical specifications for a public works project. The document is a public record even if retained by the private consultant.
- An employee works on City business at home. A document prepared on home computer is a public record.

“Writing”

“Handwriting, typewriting, printing, photostatting, photographing, and every other means of recording any form of communication or representation.”

Examples:

Papers, emails, maps, data tapes, photos, videos, discs, sound recordings, etc.

Is this a public record?

Date: Thu, 29 Nov 2007 22:51:57 -0700
From: ED HANSEN
To: "Emmert, Mark" <pres@u.washington.edu>,

Subject: conditional pledges of law school scholarship funding.

Dr. Emmert,

I have written two lengthy email letters to you in the last month expressing my disappointment regarding UW football coach Tyrone Willingham and athletic director Todd Turner. I know you are very busy as the President of the University of Washington and suspect that you have received hundreds if not thousands of letters discussing these subjects. Thus, I understand your failure to acknowledge or respond to either of my letters.

Assuming you have not read my letters, either because they were too lengthy or you were too busy, I will make this letter shorter and to the point. I hope someone on your staff will bring it to your attention.

Published by Seattle Times, and many others, January 2008

What about this...?

February, 2011

twitter

Login Join Twitter!

15 hours in Council today very hard
hitting day and the usual collection of
retards in public gallery spoiling it for
real people.

about 13 hours ago via Twitter for BlackBerry®

Retweeted by 1 person



Johnfareham

John Fareham

Basic Equation

- Almost everything is a “public record”

AND

- All public records get disclosed unless exempt

Types of Exemptions*

- Personal info that would violate a right of privacy
- Active law enforcement investigative records
- Applications for public employment
- Valuable formulae and research data
- Preliminary drafts, recommendations, and intra-agency memos in which opinions are expressed
- Attorney work-product
- “Other Statutes”
- And dozens of very narrow exemptions, like:
 - Ginseng production records
 - Location of archeological sites

***without details**

So, this means...



- Work-related “writings” are *probably* Public Records
- Most Public Records get disclosed therefore:
- Don’t write things you wouldn’t want to see on the front page of the paper
(sometimes a visit or phone call would be better)

A few words about process...

Public Records Officer

- Agencies must appoint a public records officer whose responsibility is to serve as a point of contact for the public.
- Our Public Records Officer (PRO) is Christine Brown.
- Records requests should go to the PRO.
- Records are collected, redacted, and disclosed there – although many other people work on collecting and reviewing those records.

Forms of Request

- The law does not require a particular format for requests.
- Requests can be made verbally, in writing, via e-mail, or fax.
- When an oral request is made, it should be turned into writing and verified.

Fine Points of Responses

- Negotiating a narrowed request
- Installments
- Redactions
- Explanations and Privilege logs
- Charges for copies

Fees, Costs, and Penalties

- If a requester wins a legal action against the City, the requester may be awarded **attorney's fees, costs, and penalties**.
- Daily penalties for improper withholding or denial



The Seattle Times

**Court lowers King
County disclosure
penalty to \$371,000**

-March 25, 2010

PRA Training Requirements, Effective July 1, 2014

- Every local elected official and every local government PRO must receive records training;
- This training must be completed no later than 90 days after these elected officials and PROs take their oath of office or assume their duties. They must also receive “refresher” training at intervals of no more than four years.

Retention of Records

- Destruction of public records is governed by lengthy “retention schedules”
- But One Thing is Clear: Once a public records request is made for a record, the document may not be destroyed.

If you forget everything else, remember the following:

- **Assume every kind of record may get disclosed**
 - Accidentally
 - By law
- **Use City email account, not personal email account for City business.**
- **Give some thought before creating a record**
 - Could it be better handled in person or on the phone?
 - How will it read to an outsider? In the paper?
- **When you're asked to search for records, be diligent the first time**
- **Don't destroy records after they are requested**

Preserving Erickson Avenue's Look, Feel and Historic Buildings

ENGAGEMENT

1. Develop an outreach plan that encourages the Historic Preservation Commission to develop a positive working relationship with the property owners of historic buildings. Invest time and energy up front to give the Historic Preservation Commission an opportunity to make owners aware of the value the community places on these buildings and potential advantages of owning historical buildings.

2. Building these relationships gives the Preservation Commission a chance to get to know the properties as well as their owners and develop an appreciation for the following realities facing property owners with historic structures.

a. Maintaining old structures is time consuming, expensive and many are not in good condition.

b. The buildings are generally small and have a relatively limited amount of rentable space. Most are no longer at the best and highest use for the property, so it is typically not a lucrative real estate investment for the current owner from a cash flow standpoint.

c. Most of the historic buildings are non-compliant with many aspects of the current zoning and building code. This covers everything from site placement, set backs, proximity to critical areas, storm water management, ADA accommodations and building structure.

d. Renovations and modifications are challenging because working on old buildings is often more difficult and expensive. Even needed repairs and changes can require some or all of the building and/or site to be brought up to current building code.

e. Many owners along Ericksen Avenue have owned their property for years and it is likely a large part of their nest egg. So while the historic nature is important to many, maximizing the value upon a sale may prove more compelling. This is even truer when a sale of the property is required to settle the estate.

f. Without the historic building designation there are no property tax breaks. The designation is difficult for owners who use their property for commercial purposes because it adds additional time, effort and expense to making modifications. Most property owners view the historic designation as something to avoid rather than as an asset.

These factors along with Ericksen Avenue's proximity to downtown Winslow and the ferry make it certain that in time that the historic structures will disappear if the entire burden for maintaining the historic buildings is placed on the property owners.

SOLUTIONS

If the community and the Historic Preservation Commission and Design Review Board deem Ericksen Avenue's look, feel and historical properties worth preserving the following approaches could result in the desired outcome of saving the historic structures and encouraging compatible redevelopment.

Update Ericksen Avenue Guidelines and Zoning

- Revisit and update the Ericksen Overlay Guidelines and zoning for Ericksen and to make sure intent/goals and requirements are synchronized. Many of the existing historic building elements (building scale, height and placement on lot) seen on Ericksen are exactly the elements worth preserving and encouraging in redevelopment. Since there are relatively few historic properties remaining, the goal should be to have zoning requirements and guidelines in place that easily make any rework or redevelopment capture, maintain and enhance the historic feel of the street.

Historic Designation

- Create an exemption to eliminate the non-conformity of historic buildings. The current zoning and code has made most of the historic buildings non-conforming. Most of the structures cannot be reconstructed or expanded as they are or placed in the same locations on the property if they were lost. Institute flexibility in the code and zoning to account for the unique situations that exist with current buildings and their placement on the property. Provide flexibility for renovations, modifications, and needed upgrades to historic structures so that they are not required to bring the entire building or site into compliance with the current building code. Empower planning and engineering with the flexibility to address and remove obstacles.

Create Incentives & Provide an Avenue to Address Obstacles

- Incentivize historic property owners through expedited permitting. Reduce or eliminate permitting connection and impact fees for historic property owners to keep and maintain their buildings. Since there are very few buildings that would be the impact to the city would be minimal.
- Develop a secondary tier designation for historic structures within BIMC 18.24 that has less stringent criteria that acknowledge the realities of working on historic structures and offer increased flexibility. This would provide incentives and benefits that encourage owners of "register eligible" property to participate.
- Address projects as a team – with the Planning Department, Historic Preservation Commission, Design Review Board and Applicant looking at each project on a case-by-case basis to insure the overarching principals of the Ericksen Avenue Design Guidelines are met and obstacles can be identified and addressed. Consider use on a case-by-case basis.

Long Term Approach

- Work with community members to develop a historic land trust type entity to purchase historically significant properties so the properties are preserved and maintained in perpetuity.
- Study how other communities have successfully addressed historic preservation and consider adopting successful approaches.

Ericksen Avenue Guideline Notes

The Ericksen Avenue Overlay District Guidelines provide important guidance in preserving the street but there are conflicts created between intent and the specific guidelines themselves. Examples of these are listed below.

Because each property and project is different flexibility is needed for Planning, the HPC and the DRB by allowing the projects to be reviewed on a case by case basis allows for the intent to be met.

SD1: Additions to existing structures shall be located to the rear...

In some cases adding on to the rear of the structure may not be the best option.

SD3: Reinforce the historic pattern of development by retaining open-air view corridors from Ericksen Avenue through to the Winslow Ravine:

This creates non conforming properties: 11 of the 18 properties are non conforming when structures are considered. Most are non conforming when trees, fences and mature landscaping is included. By creating non conforming buildings it limits owners ability to restore or replace the structures in the event of a loss.

Since the majority of the existing historic buildings do not conform to this pattern - It also limits the ability to replicate historic patterns of building placement.

SD4: Buildings shall be set back from the front property line in accordance with the zoning ordinance...

In some many cases this creates additional nonconformity because existing historic building are set back to far from the street.

SD5: Landscaped Front Yards: ...

Encourage significant trees and mature landscaping to be saved where possible/feasible. Mature trees and landscaping contribute as much to the feeling of the street as the buildings.

BD2: Pitched Roofs: Roof pitches on main roofs shall have at least 8:12 and no more than 12:12.

In some cases existing historic building do not have a roof pitch as steep as 8:12.

The Overlay does not address that most of the historic buildings are non - conforming. Recognition of this and providing flexibility for property owners who wish to rebuild, restore or remodel would make it much easier to retain the structures.

September ___, 2015

TO: Bainbridge City Council

CC: Kathy Cook, Director
Planning and Community Development

Doug Schultz, City Manager

FROM: Bainbridge Design Review Board

Over the past year members of the Design Review Board (DRB) have expressed some concerns that we feel now merit forwarding on to councilmembers. The DRB is involved in very early reviews of development proposals. The expertise represented by DRB members allow for a depth of review based on seasoned experience and a deep understanding of development processes and the City's development regulations. In many ways we function like a "canary in a coal mine" in that we see things at the project level that raise concerns about broader development implications. We understand our role in the City's regulatory procedures but believe some steps could be taken to enhance our processes and better prepare us for the cumulative impacts of individual development projects.

Added Involvement of Other City Commissions and Boards

As mentioned above, the DRB is involved in early reviews of project applications. Many of those applications may impact historic projects on Bainbridge Island or seek to expand the formal and informal system of pedestrian and non-motorized paths. Oftentimes these projects and city staff don't initially seek advice from other City commissions that could help address any concerns with the project. Combining some joint reviews of the DRB with appropriate Historic Preservation Commission members and the City's Non-Motorized Transportation Advisory Committee at an early stage assists the development in better understanding all of the potential issues faced by their project and allows for better coordination later. This is especially true of trail proposals where we aren't sure how they fit in a larger plan or program for the Island. While logistics will be more difficult we have found that better reviews done early in the project's development save time later.

Cumulative Impacts of Development

The DRB reviews individual project applications for larger development projects and/or development in our Neighborhood Service Center. In reviews for projects in Lynnwood Center and the Downtown Core we have consistently asked about broader community impacts. Rolling Bay is now rising to this level of concern. In most cases, individual projects may not, in and of themselves, create significant impacts. However their impacts in combination with other development projects evaluated individually can become significant. In the case of

Lynnwood Center, we have yet to see any service area-wide transportation or parking analysis required of applicants. We have seen significant growth in the Service Area with many positive developments. However as the last parcels within the Service Area begin seeking development permits the opportunity to evaluate the area as a whole is diminishing. We are worried that cumulative impacts of these multiple projects will diminish the qualities we currently see in Lynnwood Center.

Similarly in the case of the Bainbridge Rowing Club's efforts to improve their facility in Waterfront Park – questions regarding overall traffic circulation and parking are unanswered as the project, itself, was not seen to create enough impact to warrant such a broader study. We know that many plans have been done for the Winslow area but can't get clear direction as to the actions to be taken. So questions are unanswered and another project approved. In Rolling Bay, however, a recent project was required to fund a transportation study as part of its application. However, the study is directed more towards the traffic generated by the project and not towards evaluating its real parking needs (is it overparked or underparked, for instance) and traffic impacts at the nearby intersection and evaluating opportunities for better bike and pedestrian facilities.

In the end, we are concerned that there will be many unintended consequences to all of these individual actions. As the Comprehensive Plan update moves to later phases we may get to some of these issues. But we are losing the opportunity to evaluate them in the midst of real development proposals and later solutions may not matter or be cost prohibitive.

In the past year we have had many great conversations with City staffs and project applicants. We have engaged the Planning and Community Development Department in updating application submittal needs to address our early review needs. We believe that process has worked well and have appreciated the Department's leadership through Director Kathy Cook in moving these issues. We understand our limited role within the Island's land use regulation process and are not seeking to expand our mandate. However we believe a little more coordination with appropriate advisory bodies will assist applicants in better understanding the range of issues facing their projects and will save them time later.

In the case of cumulative impacts, the City's canary isn't singing very well and we look forward to working with City staffs to ensure we meet the goals of our Comprehensive Plan and Development regulations. We are happy to discuss further as you direct.