



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020
2:00 – 5:00 PM
ZOOM WEBINAR

THE DESIGN REVIEW BOARD WILL HOLD THIS MEETING USING A VIRTUAL, ZOOM WEBINAR, PER GOVERNOR INSLEE'S "STAY HOME, STAY HEALTHY" ORDERS.

MEMBERS OF THE PUBLIC WILL BE ABLE TO CALL IN TO THE ZOOM MEETING.

PLEASE CLICK THE LINK BELOW TO JOIN THE WEBINAR:

<https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/91859824040>

OR IPHONE ONE-TAP:

US: +16465588656,,91859824040# or +16699009128,,91859824040#

OR TELEPHONE:

DIAL (FOR HIGHER QUALITY, DIAL A NUMBER BASED ON YOUR CURRENT LOCATION):
US: +1 646 558 8656 or +1 669 900 9128 or +1 253 215 8782 or +1 301 715 8592 or +1 312 626 6799 or
+1 346 248 7799

WEBINAR ID: 918 5982 4040

INTERNATIONAL NUMBERS AVAILABLE: <https://bainbridgewa.zoom.us/j/91859824040>

AGENDA

- | | |
|---------|---|
| 2:00 PM | Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics) |
| 2:05 PM | Approval of Minutes
March 2, 2020 |
| 2:10 PM | Fraik Short Plat (PLN51709 DRB)
Project Manager: Ellen Fairleigh
Conceptual Review Meeting
<i>See digital file for materials</i> |
| 2:40 PM | KBA Short Plat (PLN51711 DRB-DG)
Project Manager: Ellen Fairleigh
Design Review Meeting
<i>See digital file for materials</i> |

For special accommodations, please contact Planning & Community Development
206-780-3750 or at pcd@bainbridgewa.gov



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

DESIGN REVIEW BOARD
SPECIAL MEETING
MONDAY, MAY 18, 2020
2:00 – 5:00 PM
ZOOM WEBINAR

-
-
- | | |
|---------|--|
| 3:40 PM | Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA/SPRA)
Project Manager: Ellen Fairleigh
Confirm Recommendation for Planning Commission
<i>See attached materials</i>
<i>Complete Recorded Motion document that was started at</i>
<i>03/02/2020 meeting</i> |
| 4:40 PM | New/Old Business <ul style="list-style-type: none">• Board Member Issues/Concerns |
| 4:45 PM | Adjourn |

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review and Approval of Amended Minutes – January 6, 2020
Review and Approval of Minutes – February 3, 2020
PBV Fairyland ([SPRA13880B-1](#))
Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA/SPRA)
My Office ([PLN51683 DRB-DG](#))
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Joseph Dunstan called the meeting to order at 2:04 PM. Design Review Board members in attendance were Jane Rein, Michael Loverich, Todd Theil, Shawn Parks and Laurel Wilson. Planning Commissioners Don Doman and John Quitslund were present. City Council member Leslie Schneider was present. City Staff present were Planning Manager David Greetham, Senior Planners Kelly Tayara and Peter Best, Associate Planners Annie Hillier and Ellen Farleigh and Administrative Specialist Marlene Schubert who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed, and no conflicts were disclosed.

Review and Approval of Amended Minutes – January 6, 2020

Motion: I move to approve.

Thiel/Rein: Passed Unanimously

Review and Approval of Minutes – February 3, 2020

Motion: I move to approve.

Thiel/Loverich: Passed Unanimously

PBV Fairyland ([SPRA13880B-1](#))

Review & Recommendation Meeting – Annie Hillier, Planner

See attached DRB Recorded Motion

Motion: I move to approve

Rein/Thiel – Passed Unanimously

Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA/SPRA)

Confirm Recommendation for Planning Commission – Ellen Farleigh, Planner

Discussion Only – DRB Recorded Motion will be completed at 04/06/2020 meeting

My Office ([PLN51683 DRB-DG](#))

Design Guidance Meeting – Kelly Tayara, Planner

Discussion Only

New/Old Business

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:04 PM

Approved by:

Joseph Dunstan, Chair

Marlene Schubert, Administrative Specialist



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD – REGULAR MEETING
March 3, 2020

PLEASE PRINT

Join

ListServ

Yes/No

Name	Affiliation	Phone/ E-Mail	
Michael Lovejoy	DRB		
JANE REINH	DRB		
JOE DENNEY	DRB		
DOUG RAYH	CITYZEN	RAYH@MSN.COM	
TOO TUEL	DRB		
Nicki Clayton	Pending DRB		
Donna Brown	Plan Com	don.doman@gmail.com	Yes
Bob Russek	Reserv	bobrussek167@gmail.com	
Peter Best	PCD		
Annie Hillier	PCD		
Wmman	architect		
Stacy	Architect		
Terie Stephenson	Planning Comm.		
David Greenham	PCD		
Leslie Schneider	Council Liaison		
Stacy Parks	DRB		
Angela Wilson	DRB		



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FINAL DESIGN REVIEW Bainbridge Island, Washington

PROJECT: PBV Fairyland (SPRA13880B-1)
DATE: March 2, 2020
PROJECT PLANNER: Annie Hillier
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD MEETING DATES: 04/01/2019 (Conceptual); 4/5/2019 (Design Guidance); 11/04/2019 (Design Guidance); 03/02/2020 (Review-Recommend)

CONTEXT ANALYSIS

- C1** ANALYZE NATURAL RESOURCES
- C2** IDENTIFY EXTENT AND VALUE OF WILDLIFE HABITAT AND CORRIDORS
- C3** ASSESS UNIQUE AND PROMINENT FEATURES
- C4** CONSIDER THE DEFINING ATTRIBUTES OF THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT
- C5** ANALYZE SYSTEMS OF MOVEMENT AND ACCESS
- C6** STUDY HOW THE SITE RELATES TO/CONTRIBUTES TO THE PUBLIC REALM.

Context Discussion:

1.

SITE DESIGN STANDARDS

- S1** PROTECT AND REPAIR NATURAL SYSTEMS
- S2** PRESERVE, RESTORE AND ENRICH WILDLIFE HABITAT
- S3** RESPECT AND MAGNIFY UNIQUE ASPECTS OF THE SITE AND CONTEXT
- S4** COMPLEMENT AND CONTRIBUTE TO THE BUILT ENVIRONMENT AND LOCAL IDENTITY

S5 FIT THE PROJECT INTO THE SYSTEMS OF ACCESS AND MOVEMENT, PRIORITIZING PEOPLE

Site Design Findings: Proposed project meets Standards S1 through S6

Site Design Discussion:

1. Using 3 strategies: tree protection, minimizing impervious surfaces, using pin pile system, minimizing utilities and infiltrate stormwater.
2. Leave ground plane, habitat undisturbed
3. Protecting natural flora, tree canopy, and adjacent woodlands.
4. Cottages are on stilts, unique response in a desire to preserve site. Elevated complements what is around the cottages. Meets guidelines b, c and d.
5. Pedestrian-oriented community, all homes accessed via raised platforms, vehicles are kept at edge of site (in garages), bicycle parking in garages. Meets guideline d
6. S6 – meets standard

PUBLIC REALM STANDARDS

**P1 CREATE A SAFE AND COMFORTABLE ENVIRONMENT FOR WALKING AND
CYCLING**

P2 THE IMPACT OF VEHICLES ON THE PUBLIC REALM

P3 DESIGN TO CREATE A LEDGIBLE HEIRARCHY OF PUBLIC SPACES

P4 STRENGHTEN PUBLIC SPACE CONNECTIONS

P5 DRAW FROM AND ENHANCE EXISTING BLOCK AND FRONTAGE PATTERNS

P6 FOSTER INTEREST AND ACTIVITY ALONG COMMERCIAL STREETS

Public Realm Findings: Proposed project meets Standards P1 through P6.

Public Realm Discussion:

1. Pedestrian-oriented, access to shopping. Will not be creating a bike route, ADA compliant walkway with lighting. Meets guidelines a, b and c.
2. Three things identified: landscape screening, recessing garages into slope, use living roof on garages. Meets guidelines b, c, d and e.

3. Not an urban project, doesn't encourage public spaces. Project considers vistas and views. The intention is the boardwalk will continue on to the trail. Meets guidelines a, b and d.
4. Majority of units have their porches overlooking common area of site. Meets guidelines a and b.
5. Trying to create a cluster of homes set into woods, facing onto the street which is the boardwalk. Meets guidelines c and d.
6. No commercial nearby. P6 does not apply (N/A).

DESIGN STANDARDS

- B1** EXPRESS A CLEAR ORGANIZING ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT
- B2** USE AN ARCHITECTURAL LANGUAGE APPROPRIATE TO BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
- B3** CREATE WELL COMPOSED FACADES AT ALL SCALES
- B4** CELEBRATE AND PROMINENTLY FEATURE SUSTAINABLE DESIGN
- B5** USE HIGH QUALITY MATERIALS AND WELL - CRAFTED DESIGN

Building Design Findings: Proposed project meets Standards B1 through B5.

Building Design Discussion:

1. Project presents a clear organizing concept. Meets guidelines a through f. This project does this very well.
2. Northwest design, use of natural materials, lots of glass, small-scale. Thoughtful design. Meets guidelines a through d.
3. Small scale structures, each orientation of the building has a unique design, maximize privacy. Screened trash facilities are located between garages. Meets guidelines a through g.
4. Building have compact form, low-impact design, high performance envelope, maximize natural light, living roof, no solar. Meets guidelines a through g.
5. Buildings will have exposed steel structure, expressed wood structure for the roof, glass fenestration. Meets guidelines a and c.

LANDSCAPE STANDARDS

- L1** INTEGRATE THE LANDSCAPE CONCEPT TO COMPLEMENT THE ARCHITECTURAL CONCEPT

- L2** SUPPORT THE PUBLIC REALM WITH THE LANDSCAPE DESIGN
- L3** INTEGRATE SUSTAINABLE FEATURES INTO THE LANDSCAPE AND MAKE THEM VISIBLE
- L4** INTEGRATE AND HIGHLIGHT GREEN INFRASTRUCTURE PRACTICES
- L5** SUPPORT HEALTHY HABITAT IN THE LANDSCAPE
- L6** PRESERVE AND ENHANCE IMPORTANT VIEWS AND CORRIDORS

Landscape Findings: Proposed project meets standards L1 through L6.

Landscape Discussion:

1. Not doing a lot of landscaping because leaving natural. Adding perimeter screening. Due to the low-impact of the development, using restorative approach. Meets guidelines a and e.
2. Retaining natural landscaping and integrating public walkway into the landscape. This is an exceptional example of landscape design. Meets guidelines a and c.
3. Preserving the forest is the ultimate sustainability feature. This is very well done on this project. Meets guidelines.
4. Key strategy: Roof run-off. Meets guidelines a through d.
5. Allowing forest to remain, preserving large trees (as many as possible). This is done very well. Meets guidelines a through d.
6. Views through the site and through the lower forested area, there are filtered waters views. Landscape screening will grow to screen the project, not blocking views. Meets guidelines a through d.

STREET TYPES AND FRONTAGES

Street Type:

Findings: Street type not applicable for this project.

Discussion:

1. There are no street frontages. This is not applicable (N/A).

LARGER SITES

STANDARD1 DESIGN THE SITE BY CLUSTERING BUILDINGS AND ARRANGING THEM WITH FRONTAGES ON PUBLIC STREETS, PUBLIC SPACES, OR OPEN SPACE.

STANDARD2 DESIGN SITES TO MINIMIZE THE VISUAL IMPACT OF PARKING ON THE PUBLIC REALM.

Larger Sites Findings: Proposed project meets standards 1 and 2.

Larger Sites Discussion:

1. Buildings are clustered and front on open space.
2. Parking garages are away from public realm. Meets guidelines a through d.

This project is recommended for:

Approval ___ unanimous approval X

Approval with the following conditions: NONE

1.

2.

Denial: _____

APPROVED BY: _____

Joe Dunstan, Chair

DATE: _____

3.2.2020



April 8, 2020

City of Bainbridge Island
Attn: Barry Loveless
280 Madison Ave N
Bainbridge Island, WA 98110

Re: Critical Area Review for the Proposed Police & Court Facility Located at 8804 Madison Ave N in the City of Bainbridge Island

Wetland Resources, Inc. (WRI) was contracted to assess critical area impacts that could result from a proposed 484 square-foot addition to an existing structure located at 8804 Madison Ave N, the future Bainbridge Island Police and Court Facility. WRI staff conducted a site visit on March 17, 2020 to better understand existing conditions. This letter assesses site conditions in the context of the exemptions described in section 16.20.040 of the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code (BIMC).

Site background was provided by City staff, which included the reports titled *Buffer Mitigation Plan for Harrison Urgent Care* (date: October 2013, author: Ecological Land Services), and *Critical Areas Report for Sakai Park* (date: October 2018, author: Ecological Land Services). Among other things, these reports describe the methodology used to delineate on-site and nearby critical area features.

Based on physical observation during the March site visit, WRI staff agrees with the surveyed critical boundaries delineated by Ecological Land Services in 2013 and 2018. Critical area boundaries are expected to remain consistent over time given the steep topographic transition from wetland to upland conditions. The on-site wetland was classified as a Category II wetland, and requires a 110-foot standard buffer. The off-site stream is now classified as a Type F stream, which requires a 200-foot buffer. Strict application of a 200-foot buffer would create nonconforming development within the subject property, including the 484 square-foot addition area.

The 2013 Buffer Mitigation Plan was needed to accommodate a stormwater outfall pipe within the wetland buffer. The plan included demarcation of the limits of the critical area buffer with split-rail fencing. All areas landward of the split-rail fence are developed in some form, including the proposed building addition area. The building addition area consists of a rockery and maintained lawn over existing stormwater infrastructure, which includes a gravel-filled dispersion trench with drain covers that provide overflow protection. Figure 1 below depicts the proposed building addition area.



Figure 1: Proposed Building Addition Area

The 484 square-foot building addition is proposed between the existing structure and a stormwater outfall system, in a steep area that consists of maintained lawn above stormwater infrastructure. Vegetation over the stormwater system is regularly maintained grass, and periodic maintenance related to the structure occurs in this area. The developed condition of the site prevents establishment of native plants, which would provide wildlife habitat value through screening and forage. Steep topography eliminates the potential to perform or support hydrologic control or water quality improvement functions. Overall, the area landward of the split-rail fence provides no ecological support functions to protect the nearby wetland and stream complex.

Section 16.20.040(B)(1) of the Bainbridge Island Municipal Code (BIMC) provides relief for non-conforming areas such as the proposed building addition area. This code section appears to support the applicant's proposal to expand the existing structure, and reads as follows:

1. Actions within a portion of a wetland buffer or fish and wildlife habitat conservation area buffer separated from the critical area by an existing permanent substantial development, use or activity which serves to eliminate or greatly reduce the impact of the proposed activity on the critical area are exempt from establishing the full required buffer width; provided, that impacts to the critical area do not increase.

Based on WRI staff findings during the March site visit, all areas located landward of the split-rail fence and within 200 feet of the off-site stream are considered permanent substantial development, and establish functional isolation from the critical area. This assertion is based on the demonstrated absence of hydrologic and habitat support, and the permanence of the physical separation.

The proposed addition will not increase impacts to the critical area relative to the existing developed condition. The proposed project does not require mitigation because it does not impact critical areas, and is not expected to create incidental damage to the critical area because the split-rail fence clearly demarcates the limits of the buffer. If vegetation removal does occur inside of the split-rail fence, a restoration plan will be drafted and submitted to the City of Bainbridge Island for review and approval.

Wetland Resources, Inc.



Niels Pedersen, PWS
Senior Ecologist



Alia Richardson
Associate Ecologist and Wildlife Biologist