



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD  
REGULARLY SCHEDULED MEETING  
MONDAY, FEBRUARY 6, 2017  
2:00 – 5:00 PM  
COUNCIL CONFERENCE ROOM  
280 MADISON AVE N  
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND, WA 98110

---

## AGENDA

- 2:00 PM Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
- 2:05 PM Approval of Minutes  
December 5, 2016
- 2:10 PM Pleasant Beach Resort Site Plan Review Amendment  
[PLN13880E SPRA](#) – Review documents received January 4  
Project Manager: Josh Machen
- 3:10 PM Roost Phase 2 Site Plan Review  
[PLN50724 SPR](#)  
Project Manager: Heather Wright
- 4:10 PM Madison Ave/Wyatt Way  
Conceptual Project Review  
Cutler Anderson Architects
- 4:40 PM New/Old Business
- 5:00 PM Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)  
Review and Approval of Minutes – November 7, 2016  
Manzanita Partners Preapplication Review (PLN50311B PRE)  
Code Process  
New/Old Business  
Adjourn

---

**Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)**

Chair Alan Grainger called the meeting to order at 2:04 pm. Design Review Board (DRB) members in attendance were Peter Perry, Jeffrey Boon, Joseph Dunstan, Jason Wilkinson, and Jim McNett. Chris Gutsche was absent and excused. City of Bainbridge Island staff present were Planners Kelly Tayara and Olivia Sontag and Administrative Assistant Lara Lant who monitored recording and prepared minutes. Planning Manager Joshua Machen joined the meeting after the Call to Order.

Alan Grainger disclosed he was longtime friends with the owner of the property under discussion but that would not influence his opinion.

**Review and Approval of Minutes – November 7, 2016**

*Motion:* I move to approve the minutes as presented for November 7, 2016.

*Perry/Dunstan:* The motion carried 6-0.

**Manzanita Partners Preapplication Review (PLN50311B PRE)**

Planner Olivia Sontag introduced herself to the DRB as a new Planner with the City of Bainbridge Island and Planner Kelly Tayara explained she was on hand to assist Olivia Sontag with her first project presented before the DRB.

Jon Thornburgh, member and managing partner of Manzanita Partners LLC, recapped the history of the project: They were currently restoring two of three buildings on two adjacent lots. The third building was in poor condition and they were assessing what they could do with it. They wanted to meet Ericksen Avenue Guidelines but had constraints including the 30% side yard requirement. Their target was to have one driveway for both buildings, with residential spaces in front and commercial spaces in the back. Parking would be tandem, with room for two cars per unit. Trash containers would be kept on the back of the lot. Jon Thornburgh said they were working with Olaf Ribeiro and engineers to save trees on the property. Alan Grainger asked how they would accommodate the six foot drop to the basement level of the buildings. Jon Thornburgh replied that the drop had been reduced to four feet in their revised plan. The DRB congratulated the applicant on revisions to their original plan and noted it contained the spirit of what the DRB was looking for.

Kelly Tayara said the project's preapplication appointment was scheduled for the next day and the plans would come before the DRB again during site plan review. She said that the 30% side yard design guideline results in a 15 feet requirement, and only 14 feet is provided. Kelly Tayara wanted to be sure the one foot discrepancy wouldn't cause a problem. Peter Perry asked if a recommendation from the DRB would help the applicant as the DRB thought it was a good design. Alan Grainger said if both lots were looked at side by side, the 30% requirement would be satisfied. Kelly Tayara noted that final measurements weren't in but wanted to bring it up in case it became an issue. Alain Grainger noted issues with setback requirements could be resolved with recommendations during site plan review. Jason Wilkinson asked if they would put together a storyboard on the project since they were demolishing one of the most historic buildings in Winslow. Jon Thornburgh said they were putting together a set of "as built" plans, as well as recycling materials during building deconstruction. Jim McNett stated this plan was a good example of future development on Ericksen Avenue. Discussion of the project finished without recommendation.

### **Code Process**

Conversation turned toward the amount of time it was taking to enact a tree ordinance. Peter Perry was concerned about the environmental damage and said the community was frustrated that developers were only doing the minimum to preserve trees. Alan Grainger noted that clear cut developments were allowed in subdivisions and that it could be years before a tree ordinance was in place. Jason Wilkinson asked about tracking landscape requirements and Kelly Tayara explained the process: Boundaries and trees were marked and development engineers inspected the site. Landscape plans were submitted upon site plan review and projects were conditioned. At the end of the project, the planner inspected the site to confirm landscape requirements were met. Additionally, applicants paid a deposit of surety to the city to ensure landscape requirements were fulfilled. The building official did not, however, hold up final certificate of occupancy based on landscape requirements.

Alan Grainger recommended preconstruction meetings on site to discuss landscape. Citizen Charles Schmid recommended that the DRB, as citizens, go out and review results of their recommendations and report back to the city. Alan Grainger wanted to know, in the event the applicant doesn't satisfy DRB recommendations, who would follow up? He observed the DRB had more enforcement clout when projects went through the Hearing Examiner. Kelly Tayara said when the DRB tied conditions to design requirements, recommendations were often met.

Alan Grainger requested Ron Peltier, Joshua Machen and Gary Christensen to make sure the DRB had an effective role in Site Assessment Development. Peter Perry asked if the DRB could help planners with challenging situations, for example, wording recommendations so they could be enforced more easily? He reminded the DRB that comments should be directed to the consultant, Kurt Latimore. Jason Wilkinson said the DRB should put together comments so they

would be prepared to speak to him. He said the DRB wanted to be effective and feel they were supporting the Planning Department, not getting in the way.

### **New/Old Business**

Planning Manager Joshua Machen entered the meeting to provide a Grow Community report back. The project was still in the public comment period so no decisions had been issued yet. Greg Lotakis, from the Grow Community, was researching and responding to issues. Shepard Way improvements were confusing. A bike *path* was required but a bike *lane* was not. There was no legal easement through the Diner so the applicant had to come up with a second option through the Pavillion. There were forty-seven conditions total. The ones that came to Joshua Machen's attention were the bike path, side walk, and screening improvements on Shephard Way. Alan Grainger noted separate conditions: #42, the landscape buffer should meet full screen requirements. The sidewalk, however, would go through the middle of the buffer, taking half the screen away. Alan Grainger said because there were no street standards, the sidewalk was up against the road. Josh Machen said the sidewalk would be on the edge and the five foot strip would be in the right of way. A sidewalk alongside the road in an urban context was ok – the DRB didn't have a problem with that.

Josh Machen said the bike path condition was poorly written and that the improved path was not a Shepard Way improvement. The improvement was not part of the original permit but part of the Phase 2 amendment. Alan Grainger summarized the update: Make sure the five-foot sidewalks were adjacent to the curb to maximize landscaping, meet full screen requirements, and keep the applicants to their word on the size of trees.

Josh Machen gave an update on Site Assessment Development (SAD) Permits: They would be required prior for applications that hadn't gone through a planning process. Projects with conceptual review would be a problem because they hadn't done site assessment work. When applicants come in for preapplication, they would provide SAD review info based on Low Impact Development design. Josh Machen stated the DRB should be aware of Low Impact Development (LID) and keep in mind design vs LID requirements. Jim McNett requested Development Engineers Janelle Hitch or Peter Corelis attend the next DRB meeting to explain LID.

Jason Wilkinson spoke about the city implementing a Green Building Code and proposed the DRB take a stance around Comprehensive Plan deliberations to ensure sustainable building be incorporated. Alan Grainger said the DRB should prepare a statement of endorsement. He said they should update Design Guidelines to reflect sustainable guidelines, noting that the DRB may not want to update Design Guidelines but just reorganize them. Reorganizing Design Guidelines was the first step to making them more user friendly and they could rewrite ineffective guidelines without city council actions.

**Adjourn**

***Motion:*** I move to adjourn the meeting.

***Mcnett/Boon:*** Motion carries unanimously.

Meeting adjourns at 4:27 pm.

Approved by:

---

Alan Grainger, Chair

---

Lara Lant, Administrative Specialist

DRAFT