

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Madrona School (PLN18970B CUP)
Wallace Cottages HDDP (PLN50589 PRE)
Low Impact Development
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Alan Grainger called the meeting to order at 2 pm. Design Review Board (DRB) members in attendance were Peter Perry, Jeffrey Boon, Joseph Dunstan, and Jim McNett.

DRB members Jason Wilkinson and Chris Gutsche were absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Manager Josh Machen, Planner Kelly Tayara, Structural Engineers Janelle Hitch and Peter Corelis and Administrative Specialist Lara Lant who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

There were no conflicts disclosed.

Madrona School (PLN18970B CUP)

Eric Engelbrecht from the Madrona School Board gave a summary of the school's history. Architect John Kennedy of SKL Architects stated they were at the master planning phase and proceeded with a slide show of the project site, recapping earlier presentations to the DRB. There was a house on site which would be demolished due to age. It would remain, however, until at least Phase 3 of the project. Jim McNett said he hoped they would reconsider the demolition. He thought the house was on a secondary list of significant buildings. John Kennedy said the parking area would be asphalted with gravel access roads on the edges. He discussed the site design and said they wanted to keep cars at the edges of the site. Joe Dunstan asked about the potential for cars spilling onto the street as parents line up for student drop off and pickup. John Kennedy replied the drive through lane would be bordered by a parking and pickup zone. Their traffic study showed the parking area plus the drop off and pickup zone would be sufficient. Joe Dunstan and Jeff Boon agreed that overflow traffic on North Madison Avenue would be a potential problem. Alan Grainger said kindergarten and prekindergarten classes were sited furthest from vehicle access, increasing traffic congestion. John Kennedy said it was favorable to the school that younger students be located further from the parking area and it would take parent cooperation to transfer children from cars to classrooms. Alan Grainger asked about the additional request of a traffic study at Highway 305 and Sportsman Club Road. Ron Peltier said most traffic turned south and the planned traffic flow would be a major inconvenience for that intersection. John Kennedy said they'd erect right-turn-only signage at the school's exit to avoid congestion. Alan Grainger said drivers would be u-turning on N Madison. Alan Grainger asked John Kennedy if they thought of connecting foot paths for pedestrian traffic to the school and he replied the school didn't want parents to pull over on

North Madison Ave so they didn't include pathways and shortcuts. Their intent was to keep all parking off North Madison Avenue and parents would self-correct driving habits once the school's headmistress communicated the rules. Eric Englebrecht said they'd been in communications with Windsong Loop residents about parking plans. He also stated the traffic study wasn't initially included because of timing with permit issuance and new regulations. Alan Grainger asked Eric Englebrecht if the school would use busses in the future and he replied it might be a future inclusion. Alan Grainger asked if busses could be incorporated as a requirement for future school permits and Josh Machen agreed this was possible. Jeff Boon suggested the left turn lane be extra wide so cars could easily exit and that angled parking be considered. John Kennedy said they will continue to work on parking design, including angled parking, with a traffic engineer. He said that an area of the playfield would be developed for occasional parking of up to 80 vehicles during events. Ron Peltier said neighbors were concerned about on street parking during events. The school's auditorium was designed to hold up to 400 people. A secondary plan such as shuttles picking people up from offsite locations should be considered.

Peter Perry asked if the school considered replanting trees to replace the ones that would be cleared. John Kennedy replied yes, that fell in line with the mission of the school. Peter Perry noted the code didn't require tree replacement, would the school commit to doing this anyway? Eric Englebrecht said yes, the school would commit to replanting trees.

Joe Dunstan asked about accessibility; he assumed that pathways would be ADA approved design and noted the grade would present challenges. Jim McNett stated adding ADA parking near fire lanes would be easy to do. John Kennedy updated the DRB on lighting plans. He said lighting would be minimal because of residential location. They were considering changes to the roof slope to take advantage of solar energy. A portion of the site didn't perc well and might have to have a retention pond. They would consider various alternatives to move stormwater to the retention pond. Materials used for the main building would include cedar and clear low e glass with punctuations of color and the main entry would not be easily visible from the street.

Motion: I move the Design Review Board approves the site plan review with the additional condition of replacing trees with trees.

Perry/McNett: The motion carried 5-0.

Wallace Cottages HDDP (PLN50589 PRE)

Kelly Tayara started the conversation with recent information regarding the access to the lots. Peter Corelis stated that the city's original preference was that access through Wallace Way continued through Fir Acres Drive to mitigate traffic impacts, but the city attorney determined this would not be a requirement. An access easement from Fir Acres Drive that was recorded on the original short plat was encumbered by a private covenant, and the easement was not depicted in subsequent recordings of the short plat and boundary line adjustment. Peter Corelis said

access to the lots had been proposed through private easement but the city's requirement for subdivisions stated that the road be dedicated as public with a 40' right of way. Dave Smith of Central Highlands said they wanted the road to be private so the lot sizes, open space and setbacks would not be affected. Nick Smith noted that originally their plan included a public road but they incorporated Design Review Board suggestions to meander the road and decided it was easier to do that with a private road. Alan Grainger asked why Central Highlands had come before the Design Review Board with a site plan with the wrong property lines and without a required right of way. Dave Smith replied that they had deadlines to meet and wanted to proceed with the meeting because the design would remain the same whether the street was public or private. Kelly Tayara said she wasn't sure how the designs could stay the same but was open to discussion. There was confusion about what existed and what was proposed. Peter Corelis said a reduction in road width could be requested but it had not been yet. He spoke about the requirements of a public road regarding turnarounds: the existing plan included a hammerhead turnaround which didn't accommodate updated access needs. Joe Dunstan said the DRB gave the initial turnaround design a "minimal" ok but now the city had a problem with the design too. Alan Grainger recommended the DRB table this review until the city and the applicant resolve the property line, right of way, easement and access issues. If the city could work it, out, the project could return to the DRB as the first agenda item on January 9th.

Dave Smith wanted clarification of which areas of the project the DRB would review. Alan replied the DRB makes recommendations to the Planning Director who then writes a letter to the Planning Commission. City Council and the Hearing Examiner would receive the information. The DRB is very clear about documents they're commenting on so the Hearing Examiner can be clear about their recommendation. Dave Smith wanted to know which parts of his presentation the DRB would comment on. Alan replied it was a HDDP project therefore demonstrating innovative site development and a site plan was part of review.

Jeff Boon asked the applicants for the status of the acquisition of the veterinary clinic property. Dave Smith said the acquisition would improve circulation and safety and they were halfway way to completing the purchase. Jeff Boon reminded him that the Design Review Board needed to look at the property the applicant currently owned. Peter Perry asked the applicant to make sure they brought a tree plan to the next review.

Alan Grainger invited members of the public to comment. Billie Nash asked Peter Corelis if he was aware of the neighborhood impact of Wallace Way being paved from Madison Avenue N to Grow Avenue. Peter Corelis replied he was aware but that it would be a system improvement for the greater good with a local impact. Betty Weiss submitted a letter from neighbors in the area in support of the purchase of the veterinary clinic by the applicant. This letter was sent to the property owner of the clinic, not the city (the letter was submitted for the record.)

Low Impact Development

Janelle Hitch, Development Engineer for the city, introduced herself to the Design Review Board and told them about new code requirements based on recently adopted 2012 stormwater requirements. These requirements were mandated by the city's National Pollutant Discharge Elimination System (NPDES) permit. The new code requirements would take effect January 2017. She presented information from the Washington Stormwater Center's Low Impact Development Training Program: <http://www.wastormwatercenter.org/lidswtrainingprogram/>, specifically slides from Module 3.4 – Intermediate Low Impact Development (LID) Topics: Site Assessment, Planning, and Layout (Western Washington). She stated the Department of Ecology's definition of LID: LID is a stormwater and land use management strategy that strives to mimic pre-disturbance hydrologic processes by emphasizing conservation, use of on-site natural features, site planning, and distributed stormwater management practices (BMPs) that are integrated into a project design. LID BMPs emphasize pre-disturbance hydrologic process of infiltration, filtration, storage, evaporation and transpiration. Common LID BMPs include: bioretention, rain gardens, permeable pavements, minimal excavation foundations, vegetated roofs, and rainwater harvesting.

Alan Grainger said it was important to the Design Review Board to have applicants talk to them about site plan concepts so they could understand their approach to LID. Janelle Hitch said LID began with site assessment and that the city had updated the Administrative Manual to reflect additional requirements. Site assessments would be required at the preapplication stage and applicants would need to consider LID when they came to the Design Review Board for conceptual review. Topography, soil, hydrography, wetlands, surrounding land use, zoning, and utility placement are examples of applicant considerations. Janelle Hitch stated applicants will have to manage their water, especially quantity, based on stormwater management manual requirements. The keystone of LID is full dispersion or full infiltration. In order to get full dispersion, it's the 65-10-25 rule: 65% native vegetation, 10% hard surface, and 25% lawn/landscape. The problem on this island is the hardpan makes it difficult for full infiltration. Some combination of infiltration and dispersion is how to accomplish LID. Some things that strip away our ability to do these things, is what the city thinks is practical differs from what a developer thinks is practical. Janelle Hitch spoke about "exempt water", which means a developer able to move their clean stormwater to an exempt body of water (such as Puget Sound) doesn't have to manage it.

Councilmember Peltier asked if developers accessed city stormwater pipes, would that be exempt water and developers wouldn't have to worry about LID? Janelle Hitch replied they would still need infiltration where feasible but wouldn't have to meet full dispersion. The city is still working on how to deal with this. Some projects may have unintended consequences like removing trees to allow water to infiltrate on site per rules vs dispersing on site. Councilmember Peltier said the Tree Ad Hoc/LID committee was considering these same things and invited the Design Review Board members to attend the next meeting.

Joe Dunstan noted the Planning Department had to look at projects in total. LID would fail if planners only considered the parcel in front of them. Janelle Hitch said these practices would be developing over time. The adopted DOE guidelines had been in place in other cities for a few years, developers should be aware it was coming to Bainbridge Island. Peter Perry noted that this practice needed to be adopted to protect the community from overdevelopment. Alan Grainger said this was music to the Design Review Board's ears and they would be extremely supportive to influence site plans to meet requirements of LID. He stated the Design Review Board would be cautious not to be the enforcer. Ron Peltier again invited the Design Review Board to the Tree Ad Hoc meetings – Wednesdays at 3 pm.

New/Old Business

Alan Grainger reported that at the request of Bainbridge Island School District (BISD), he represented Design Review Board recommendations to City Council. He said there was a misunderstanding about lot coverage. BISD wanted a more creative site plan through a more flexible arrangement of structures. City Council seemed to think this was adding density. Alan Grainger said one way density is considered is floor area ratio, another way is dwellings per acre. He said the way it had been discussed, it was as if the proposal was increasing what they could build. BISD wanted a bigger footprint but they didn't want additional floor area, which Alan Grainger thought was a more appropriate design for a school.

Alan Grainger noted that the Design Review Board meeting dates in January fell on holidays. He proposed two special meetings, one on January 9th and one on January 23rd. Alan Grainger noted that the City Council wanted a report from the Design Review Board on their 2016 activities and provide a plan for 2017. He would put together a draft of 2016 work and present it to the group for consideration. He would like, as a group, to put together 2017 plans.

Adjourn

Motion: I move to adjourn.

Boon/Dunstan: The motion passes unanimously.

The meeting adjourned at 5:27 pm

Approved by:

Alan Grainger, Chair

Lara Lant, Administrative Specialist

