

Ellen Fairleigh

From: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 5:28 PM
To: Ellen Fairleigh
Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Bainbridge Island organization. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Sorry Ellen – your dates are good! I also owe you answers to your questions. I haven't forgotten.

stay safe!



Nancy Sears

Please note email change below



11232 120th Ave NE, Suite 204
Kirkland, WA 98033

Nancy Sears
Sr. LU Specialist
nancy.sears@smartlinkgroup.com
c. 425-444-1434
www.smartlinkgroup.com

From: Ellen Fairleigh <efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov>
Sent: Wednesday, May 5, 2021 3:27 PM
To: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>
Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

Hi Nancy,

I'm reaching back out to see if you've had an opportunity to consider the new potential dates for your project to go to Planning Commission and Hearing Examiner.

Please let me know as soon as you are able.

Best,

Ellen

From: Ellen Fairleigh
Sent: Tuesday, May 4, 2021 11:58 AM
To: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>
Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

Hello Nancy,

Thanks for this information. Due to some outstanding issues the City needs to adjust the previously agreed to timeline for this project. The deadline for the staff report is tomorrow, and the project has not yet been approved by the KPHD and there is a pending question related to the noise survey.

Due to these issues, are you agreeable to some flexibility in pushing the Planning Commission public meeting for this project from 5/13 to 5/27 and also pushing the Hearing Examiner Review from 5/27 to 6/10?

Also, from your responses below, it's my understanding that you will be submitting new plans for the building permit to install the retaining wall, and updating the project description to include the retaining wall in your work? Please confirm.

Any additional landscaping requirements will be a condition of this land use approval. It will be between the project applicant and KPUD to work out the specifics of who will install it. The staff report will include a recommendation for additional landscaping along the NE Baker Hill Rd frontage for the Planning Commission to consider.

Please let me know your thoughts on adjusting the timeline as soon as possible.

Best,

Ellen

From: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>

Sent: Thursday, April 29, 2021 4:37 PM

To: Ellen Fairleigh <efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov>

Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Bainbridge Island organization. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Here is what I have so far Ellen:

- (1) What is the status of the KPHD review? I saw your email to Richard Bazzell asking about taking the future filter plant off the site plan, but I didn't see his reply. Please let me know and I can also contact KPHD to check on status. The KPHD approval is still pending. **I uploaded the requested revision on 4/28.**
- (2) **It's my understanding from your permit submittal that the retaining wall will be constructed by KPUD. Is the plan that KPUD will submit a separate building permit for this work, or will you be including it in your permit submittal? We were just informed that KPUD wants us to complete this work, plans are being revised and will be submitted to complete this work.**
- (3) In reviewing the existing and required landscaping on site, staff will recommend a condition of approval that the landscaping be supplemented on the north side of the parcel along NE Baker Hill road, particularly within the required 10 foot landscaping buffer that was required by the 1992 short plat. Is there some reason that this is not feasible? **I would think that this would be KPUD's responsibility, if it was required by the 92 plat.**
- (4) FYI- The site plan (Sheet A1.0) indicates that the existing water tower encroaches slightly within the required 15 ft. rear setback as an existing non-conformity. The proposed antennas cannot also encroach into the setback. The site plan currently depicts two antennas encroaching into the rear setback. The staff report will

contain a recommended condition of approval that these two antennas be shifted out of the setback. **I am checking on this.**

- (5) Request- Could you please send me some supplemental information regarding the placement of the signs shown on Sheet A 4.0? For example, will they be placed on the entrance gate, on the equipment cabinets, near the water tower, etc.? This question was asked by a Planning Commissioner at the Public Participation Meeting and I want to make sure it's addressed. I don't need formal plans, but rather a written emailed narrative is fine.

Since there is no fence around our equipment, Signage will be on the equipment cabinets

- (6) Noise Survey: The noise report states that the nearest properties are 65 feet to the east of the proposed equipment, and 60 feet to the west. However, the submitted site plan depicts that the equipment is 60'6" to the east and 52'7" to the west. Can you please clarify this discrepancy? Does this difference impact the noise levels at these receiving properties? **I am checking on this.**

stay safe!



Nancy Sears

Please note email change below



11232 120th Ave NE, Suite 204
Kirkland, WA 98033

Nancy Sears
Sr. LU Specialist

nancy.sears@smartlinkgroup.com

c. 425-444-1434

www.smartlinkgroup.com

From: Ellen Fairleigh <efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 1:33 PM

To: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>

Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

Hi Nancy,

Thank you. I have one additional question. My apologies for not including this in my email from yesterday.

Noise Survey: The noise report states that the nearest properties are 65 feet to the east of the proposed equipment, and 60 feet to the west. However, the submitted site plan depicts that the equipment is 60'6" to the east and 52'7" to the west. Can you please clarify this discrepancy? Does this difference impact the noise levels at these receiving properties?

Thank you,

Ellen

From: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>

Sent: Wednesday, April 28, 2021 6:20 AM

To: Ellen Fairleigh <efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov>

Subject: RE: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

CAUTION: This email originated from outside the City of Bainbridge Island organization. DO NOT click links or open attachments unless you recognize the sender and know the content is safe.

Ellen, I just resubmitted the plans for Richard and copied you on that email. Yes the filtration system by KPUD has been removed. I am working with my team on answers to items 2-5 and will get back to you. Thanks!

Stay safe!



Nancy Sears

Please note email change below



11232 120th Ave NE, Suite 204
Kirkland, WA 98033

Nancy Sears
Sr. LU Specialist

nancy.sears@smartlinkgroup.com

c. 425-444-1434

www.smartlinkgroup.com

From: Ellen Fairleigh <efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov>

Sent: Tuesday, April 27, 2021 1:55 PM

To: Nancy Sears <Nancy.Sears@smartlinkgroup.com>

Subject: PLN51880A CUP/WCF status check

Hi Nancy,

I'm checking in with you regarding this project as the potential Planning Commission date is getting closer (May 13th). I'm looking for a status check and have the following review comments/requests:

- (1) What is the status of the KPHD review? I saw your email to Richard Bazzell asking about taking the future filter plant off the site plan, but I didn't see his reply. Please let me know and I can also contact KPHD to check on status. The KPHD approval is still pending.
- (2) It's my understanding from your permit submittal that the retaining wall will be constructed by KPUD. Is the plan that KPUD will submit a separate building permit for this work, or will you be including it in your permit submittal?
- (3) In reviewing the existing and required landscaping on site, staff will recommend a condition of approval that the landscaping be supplemented on the north side of the parcel along NE Baker Hill road, particularly within the required 10 foot landscaping buffer that was required by the 1992 short plat. Is there some reason that this is not feasible?
- (4) FYI- The site plan (Sheet A1.0) indicates that the existing water tower encroaches slightly within the required 15 ft. rear setback as an existing non-conformity. The proposed antennas cannot also encroach into the

setback. The site plan currently depicts two antennas encroaching into the rear setback. The staff report will contain a recommended condition of approval that these two antennas be shifted out of the setback.

- (5) Request- Could you please send me some supplemental information regarding the placement of the signs shown on Sheet A 4.0? For example, will they be placed on the entrance gate, on the equipment cabinets, near the water tower, etc.? This question was asked by a Planning Commissioner at the Public Participation Meeting and I want to make sure it's addressed. I don't need formal plans, but rather a written emailed narrative is fine.

Thank you,

Ellen

 CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE
ISLAND
ELLEN FAIRLEIGH
City Planner
www.bainbridgewa.gov
[facebook.com/citybainbridgeisland/](https://www.facebook.com/citybainbridgeisland/)
206.780.3767 (office) 206.780.0955 (fax)

Due to the City's COVID-19 response, the Planning and Community Development Department (PCD) has modified its operations. Please see the PCD webpage (<https://www.bainbridgewa.gov/154/Planning-Community-Development>) for current information.