

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Bainbridge Island Fire Department Station 21 (PLN11791SPR/CUP)
Bainbridge Island Fire Department Station 22 (PLN14200SPR/CUP)
Wyatt Cottages (PLN50165SPR)
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Grainger called the meeting to order at 2:06 PM. Other Design Review Board members in attendance were Jim McNett, Chuck Depew and Chris Gutsche. Peter Perry, Susan Bergen and Jeff Boon were absent and excused. City Staff present were Planning Manager Josh Machen and Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed and Mr. Grainger asked that the fire departments be reviewed in the opposite order with review of BIFD Station 22 coming first. There were not any conflicts of interest disclosed.

Bainbridge Island Fire Department Station 22 (PLN14200SPR/CUP)

Planning Manager Josh Machen gave an overview of the changes to the project citing the unexpected change in City personnel that occurred on both BIFD projects.

Brett Hansen and Chauncey Drinon from Mackenzie Architects presented the proposed site plans for both fire stations. Mr. Drinon walked the DRB through the changes made to Station 22 stating the biggest change was the removal of the public meeting space. Landscaping elements, types of shrubbery, etc., were highlighted. He stated with the removal of the public meeting room, less impervious surface would be created and more trees would be saved as the entire project would be moved further south on the site. Mr. Grainger asked if there was a site plan available that showed the reduction in parking. Mr. Hanson replied there was not one available at that time. Mr. Gutsche asked how much closer to the street the building would be. Mr. Hanson replied it would be 20-25 feet closer. Mr. Depew asked what the reduction in the building size would be. Mr. Drinon replied the building would go from 15,000 square feet to 14,000 square feet. Color and design materials were presented and described as applicable to both Fire Station 22 and 21.

Mr. McNett asked if there would be any mechanical equipment on the roof. It was stated there would not be any mechanical equipment on either of the proposed fire station roofs. Discussion of the trash enclosure ensued with Mr. Machen reminding the designers that the enclosure must be designed and built in the same style as the building.

The Design Checklist was reviewed with the following answers given by the DRB:

1. Variation in facade provided visual interest - Yes
2. Modulate scale of building - Yes
3. Limit visual impact of blank walls and facades - Yes
4. Establish visually prominent ground floor facades - Yes

5. Maintain pedestrian scale along facades - Yes
6. Maintain pedestrian activities - Yes
7. Reduce overall scale of building - Yes
8. Encourage creation of public outdoor spaces – No; Gap in application. Mr. Hanson stated they would submit the landscape plan.
9. Soften impact of built environment - Yes
10. Compatible with community and neighborhood characteristics - Yes
11. Minimize intrusiveness of signage - Yes
12. Improve pedestrian environment - Yes
13. Provide pedestrian access - Yes
14. Provide weather protection for pedestrians - Yes
15. Maintain smaller scale commercial buildings - Yes
16. Reduce visual impact of parking areas - Yes

Motion: I move conditional approval of application subject to submission of a final site plan that conforms to the new design as well as the landscaping plan that relates to that site plan based on their presentation on March 7, 2016.

Depew/Grutsche: Unanimous approval.

Bainbridge Island Fire Department Station 21 (PLN11791SPR/CUP)

Mr. Hansen provided a review of the key element questions the DRB had during the pre-application presentation. He stated there was a reduction in the size of the building by one equipment bay. Some of the administration function was moved back to the first floor with the bulk staying on the second floor. Mr. Hansen also reiterated they would be using the same materials and design concepts as Fire Station 22 to maintain continuity between fire stations as well as provide recognition from the public. The private areas of the fire station were explored and locations of the gates were shown. Discussion ensued of the roofline over the southern part of the bays/service area. Arguments were presented for moving the “fire tower” with the identifying 21 to the other end of the bays from its current situation with numerous other locations for the “21” explored. Mr. Grainger asked Mr. Machen whether the site plan typically included the landscape plans. Mr. Machen stated it could be part of it, but was not necessarily part of the Design Guidelines. He also pointed out that the landscaping plans were part of the packet and that a presentation by the actual landscape architect had not been expected in the past. The DRB asked for them to come back with landscape information as they were going to do for Station 22.

The Design Checklist was reviewed with the following answers given by the DRB:

1. Variation in façade provided visual interest - Yes
2. Modulate scale of building - Yes
3. Limit visual impact of blank walls and facades - Left Open to see south elevation again
4. Establish visually prominent ground floor facades - Yes
5. Maintain pedestrian scale along facades - Left Open to see landscape plan
6. Maintain pedestrian activities - Yes
7. Reduce overall scale of building - Yes
8. Encourage creation of public outdoor spaces - Left Open to see landscape plan
9. Soften impact of built environment - Left Open to see landscape plan
10. Compatible with community and neighborhood characteristics - Yes
11. Minimize intrusiveness of signage - Yes
12. Improve pedestrian environment - N/A

13. Provide pedestrian access - Yes
14. Provide weather protection for pedestrians - Yes
15. Maintain smaller scale commercial buildings - Yes
16. Reduce visual impact of parking areas - Yes

Motion: I move we approve the design as shown with the contingency based on the presentation of the landscape plan by the landscape architect. Approval also contingent upon material requirements brought forth at next meeting (March 7, 2016).

McNett/Depew: Passed unanimously

Wyatt Cottages PLN50165 SPR

Josh Machen provided an overview of the changes to the design that was seen at the pre-application review.

When the applicant entered, introductions were made around the table. There were two citizens/neighbors present as well as developer James Laughlin and architect Bruce Anderson. Mr. Anderson provided a review of the previous action during the pre-application phase as well as an overview of the current project mentioning that the “tot lot” park was no longer being moved. Mr. Laughlin mentioned that he held an open house at the Oliver house and invited all members of the public who left their e-mails during the pre-application phase to view the new plans which were well received. Mention was made of the two parking spaces the park district asked for the applicant to provide for the park. (BIMPRD actively discourages parking at the “tot lot.”) Mr. Grainger asked about the large scale trees in the small scale landscaping. Mr. Anderson stated those would be going closer to the park. Lighting of entry ways as well as the driveway was discussed as “moon” light as opposed to “up” lighting. Mr. McNett asked whether covers for vehicle parking would be allowed. Mr. Laughlin stated if the owners all voted for that (the development would be a condominium) they could do that but it would be written into the CCRs. There was discussion with citizens (see attached sign-in sheet) regarding the acceptability of changes made to the site plan from the previous site plan submitted.

Motion: I move acceptance of the revised site plan for the project.

Answers to Design Guidelines were:

1. **Parking lot visually unobtrusive – Yes**
2. **Open space and amenities – Yes**
3. **Pedestrian connection – Yes**
4. **Shielded lighting – Yes**
5. **Service areas screened – Yes**
6. **Common open space – Yes**
7. **Overall form – Very positive**
8. **Entrances from street clear – Yes**
9. **Mechanical equipment concealed – Yes**
10. **Structured parking – N/A**
11. **Varied details – Yes**
12. **Integrated signage – N/A**

-
-
- 13. Creativity – Yes
 - 14. Awning signs – N/A
 - 15. Landscape front setbacks – Yes
 - 16. Strong reference point to key intersections – Yes
 - 17. Residential roof forms – Not following normal, but great solution

Motion: I move acceptance of the revised site plan for the project.

Depew/McNett: Passed unanimously 4-0

New/Old Business

Mr. Grainger informed the other DRB members he would be their representative at the all-day interview process for the new Planning Director on February 23, 2016.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 6:00 PM.

Approved by:



Alan Grainger



Jane Rasely



CITY OF
BAINBRIDGE ISLAND

CITY OF BAINBRIDGE ISLAND
DESIGN REVIEW BOARD - REGULAR MEETING
February 22, 2016

PLEASE PRINT

Join
ListServ
Yes/No

Name	Affiliation	Phone/ E-Mail	Join ListServ Yes/No
Chris Gutsche	DRB	chris@eco-smith-design.com	Y
JIM McNETT	DRB		
Alan Grainger	DRB		
Ken Peltier	DRB	v.peltier@bainbr.iglob.fur	
Chuck Papaw	DRB		
Brian Kalkin	Bainbridge Review	editor@bainbridge-review.com	Y
Hank Terada	Fire	hnteran@BIFD.org	
Janine Courtemanche	Fire	flourtemanche@bifd.org	
BRETT HANSON	MACKENZIE	bhanson@mcknec.com	
CHARLES DRINDON	MACKENZIE	cdrinon@mcknec.com	
BRUCE ANDERSON	CAA	BRUCE@COTTEL-ANDERSON.COM	
CRAIG SPENCER	CITIZEN	cspencerstudio@gmail.com	
Margaret Celestina	ME16H30R	stability4@gmail.com	
James Laughlin	Applicant	jmlaughlin32@gmail.com	

