



**Design Review Board
Regularly Scheduled Meeting
Monday, January 23, 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 | Kurt Latimore Meeting with Board Members |
| 3:05 PM | Approval of Minutes January 9, 2017 |
| 3:10 PM | Feedback - Final Draft of 2016 Annual Report to City Council |
| 3:30 PM | New/Old Business |
| 4:00 PM | Work Session |
| 5:00 PM | Adjourn |

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review and Approval of Minutes – November 21, 2016
Selection of Design Review Board Chair
Process Improvement Initiative with Kurt Latimore
Review of 2016 Draft Report to City Council
Discussion of 2017 Goals
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Alan Grainger wished everyone a happy New Year and called the meeting to order at 2:00 pm. Design Review Board (DRB) members in attendance were Chris Gutsche, Jim McNett, Peter Perry, Jeff Boon, Joseph Dunstan and Jason Wilkinson. City of Bainbridge Island staff present were Director Gary Christensen and Administrative Assistant Lara Lant who monitored recording and prepared minutes. Councilmember Ron Peltier was also in attendance.

Review and Approval of Minutes – November 21, 2016

Motion: I approve the minutes as presented for November 21, 2016.

McNett/Grainger: The motion carried 7-0.

Selection of Design Review Board Chair

Motion: I nominate Alan Grainer as 2017 Chair.

McNett/Perry: The motion carried 7-0.

Grainger accepted nomination.

Process Improvement Initiative with Kurt Latimore

Alan Grainger invited DRB members to join him meeting Kurt Latimore on Thursday, January 12th. He said he was to present insights to process improvement but had yet to see any questions from Mr. Latimore.

Alan Grainger distributed hard copies of Ordinance No. 2014-19, defining the Design Review Board's duties. He reviewed the history of the DRB over the last few years and how it became critical to the review of city projects. Alan stated city council should request the DRB look at consultants' work prior to site selection of city projects such as the Police/Court facility. Ordinance No. 2014-19 did not include review of public buildings, which is why Alan Grainger brought it up.

Ron Peltier asked the DRB to remind city council that they have the skill set to review public projects. Joe Dunstan said any public facility should go through the DRB for transparency. Peter Perry reminded the DRB that automatic review of public buildings would require a change in ordinance. Alan Grainger said they shouldn't wait on an ordinance change before reviewing the Police/Court facility since it was already in progress, and reminded the DRB that they would not provide approval for the project but recommendation. Jim McNett asked if the DRB was required to review the Police/Court facility and Alan Grainger confirmed they were not. It was pointed out that if the DRB had been involved prior to a ballot measure for the last Police/Court facility proposal the measure may have succeeded and saved the public money.

Ron Peltier asked if the DRB should also review the bridge to be constructed over the highway? The DRB collectively agreed yes. Alan Grainger noted the DRB review process provided for more public input and that it added values such as safety without additional cost. Joe Dunstan spoke about how projects were reviewed by various groups. Projects were split into little pieces and one group needed to bring all the pieces together. He hoped the Latimore process review would help collect these pieces for cohesive review.

Peter Perry wanted the DRB to offer their review services for all public buildings. Gary Christensen agreed that made sense. Peter Perry reminded them that review of public buildings was not part of Ordinance No. 2014-19. Alan Grainger said it was at the request of former Mayor Anne Blair that the DRB became involved in the review of Waterfront Park.

Ron Peltier said expanding the role of the DRB had been proposed but there wasn't much enthusiasm on city council. He told Gary Christensen that if Gary advocated for the DRB's expanded role in the Comprehensive Plan, it would carry some weight.

Gary Christensen said the Latimore review process involved online surveys and interviews with developers and contractors. This week, Mr. Latimore would meet with the Mayor, the Planning Commission Chair and the Design Review Board Chair. In addition, surveys would be sent to City Council, Planning Commission and Design Review Board members, giving additional opportunity to suggest or opine what worked and what didn't. Gary Christensen said DRB members could also have a telephone conversation with the consultant. The goal was to ascertain what we could be doing better.

Alan Grainger asked Gary Christensen if the various city committees were getting the same questions? Gary said yes but he hadn't seen the questions yet. Peter Perry asked if there was any way to halt a potential clear cut while this process improvement was under way? Gary Christensen replied that a "time out" could only be initiated by city council through a moratorium. Ron Peltier said there wasn't support from city council for a moratorium based on conversation last January. He added that if Gary Christensen went to city council and suggested they consider a moratorium, it might change the council vote.

Joe Dunstan said they should eliminate subdivisions entirely in the Village core and consider more creative design. HDDP thus far had not been innovative, it just added density.

Gary Christensen suspected affordable housing would be a top priority once the Comprehensive Plan was acted on by city council (starting Jan 27 deliberations.) What kind of land use should we advocate for and/or require? The Comprehensive Plan alluded to almost a dozen affordable housing options. Ron Peltier said HDDP hasn't been mentioned in any of the Comprehensive Plan discussions. Alan Grainger said HDDP was a tactic, not a goal. Gary Christensen said the Comprehensive Plan was a policy document and he anticipated the city would assess and evaluate housing needs and choices upon its adoption. Those choices would be implemented through city codes.

Gary Christensen reminded the DRB that their comments should be given to Kurt Latimore to be captured in his report. Jason Wilkinson spoke about sustainability and green building leadership and that the city had the ability to influence development. There should be minimum standards and increased requirements if more density was desired. HDDP was a carrot, they needed a stick as well said Alan Grainger. The community was not seeing the benefits of HDDP projects, the developers were. Jason Wilkinson said a baseline green building ordinance should be passed.

Managed growth and sustainable, environmentally friendly policies met the high standard of the Comprehensive Plan draft. The challenge would be implementing those policies. Chris Gutsche said the current Comprehensive Plan document was weak. Jason Wilkinson saw consideration for a green building code but it had not been listed as a mandate in the Comprehensive Plan. A council retreat was scheduled at end of January and they will talk about their work plan for 2017. Peter Perry wanted council to prioritize handling of irreversible actions to soil and trees.

Gary Christensen said the city is required by the State to update critical area regulations. The regulations needed to be consistent with Comprehensive Plan policies. Joe Dunstan said the Island should be managed, not just growth. Growth was a part to be managed. Ron Peltier again encouraged the DRB to express their comments to city council.

Gary Christensen said the NPDS permit was now in place and was more of a tool than they ever had before and a step in right direction. Peter Perry said there was confusion regarding implementation of Low Impact Development. Gary Christensen said it was a great policy but there would be places and spaces where it would not be feasible.

Gary Christensen said the Site Assessment and Development (SAD) permit had not yet been adopted. Upon adoption, the city would figure out how it would be administered and prepare information for architects, engineers, and contractors to educate them about it.

Alan Grainger asked if subdivisions are pushing permits through because of these new regulations? Gary Christensen said yes, possibly. Alan Grainger asked if those applications would be reviewed by the DRB and Gary Christensen replied no because it was not yet in the code. The challenge was to be responsive and timely with reviews since projects were held to timelines. Alan Grainger said when applicants talk to the DRB about a concept, the clock had not yet started. He said the more they can do to encourage applicants to consult with the DRB, Planning Department and engineers, the smoother the process would be. Gary Christensen said the desire of the city was to be more efficient and predictable. The city had a preapplication process to see things in a conceptual manner. More information prior to application was the goal of the predevelopment process. The city needed to develop an efficient, predictable process to avoid applicant push back. Peter Perry agreed that it was important to give applicants and contractors education and information on new requirements.

Predevelopment was conceptual, usually had no cost, and helped applicants define the scope of their project - good reasons to give predevelopment project review to the DRB. Applicants would be better positioned for the preapplication process which would be more timely and less uncertain. Peter Perry said DRB review was a service the public didn't know about. Gary Christensen said the city needed to market the DRB in order to educate the public about the benefits of DRB review. He believed that the city and the DRB were on the same page and these comments should be conveyed to both city council and Kurt Latimore for documentation.

Joe Dunstan commented that some Planning Department staff didn't take the role of the DRB as seriously as others. Could Kurt Latimore help make their role standardized? Jim McNett said the Historic Preservation Board (HPB) had a similar experience and the HPB gave a presentation to city planners to help them understand their roles. A presentation to all the planners prevented any one planner from feeling singled out. He also felt that planning staff weren't holding the applicant accountable for a complete packet of information before they presented to the DRB, which was unfair to both the applicant and the DRB.

Alan Grainger said he'd be attending the Latimore meeting with one other DRB member. Peter Perry volunteered to attend with him. Alan Grainger requested Lara Lant give him the unofficial minutes to this meeting as soon as possible so he would have them for Thursday's meeting. Gary Christensen thanked the DRB for their efforts.

Review of 2016 Draft Report to City Council

Alan Grainger reported the DRB donated 240 hours to the city in meeting time alone and he estimated another 240 hours spent preparing for meetings. For the city not to consider the DRB a devoted group would be overlooking a great resource. He passed out a spreadsheet of projects reviewed in 2016.

Discussion of 2017 Goals

Gary Christensen spoke about two items for consideration in 2017: The roles and responsibilities of boards, commissions, city council and the planning department, and making sure the city's code would regulate and condition the kind of development the city wanted to see. Joe Dunstan spoke of the damage that occurs to property before a project appears before the DRB. Alan Grainger pointed out there was no mechanism in the city to look at projects with the idea of networks and public access and Joe Dunstan wanted to know who connected the dots between projects. Gary Christensen replied that under SEPA the city can conduct a cumulative review but it was difficult to do when projects were submitted at different times

Alan Grainger asked how best to get these comments to City Council and Ron Peltier said he could write a report to be included in the next council packet. Jason Wilkinson said he would comment at the next city council meeting.

The discussion turned towards recommending city council prioritize environmental stewardship. The overriding concern of the Comprehensive Plan was to prevent irreversible impacts. Ron Peltier said its number one principle should be environmental stewardship. Peter Perry said the DRB should review any development that could have an irreversible ecological impact.

Motion: *The top priority in the Comprehensive Plan must be environmental stewardship to prevent irreversible damage to Bainbridge Island. This should be inserted in the preamble of the Comprehensive Plan.*

Perry/Dunstan: *The motion carried 7-0.*

Joe Dunstan stated the DRB would like to play a role in reviewing public works, subdivisions, and nonmotorized projects. Jim McNett said DRB should reevaluate and update the existing city adopted design guidelines. He suggested the Smart Growth Manual as a resource as they made evaluations. Chris Gutsche preferred to work as a group on the updates before carving off specific topics for each member to update. In addition to updating the design guidelines, Joe Dunstan said he and Peter Perry wanted to put together a The DRB wanted a work session built into their regular meetings where they could discuss updating design guidelines and other topics.

In addition to updating checklist, Joe Dunstan and Peter Perry want to put together a playbook of submittals illustrating successful designs. Jason Wilkinson passed out a Green Ordinance draft to DRB members and spoke about the Living Building Challenge and 2030 Energy Targets.

Motion: *I move that sustainable design is good design and the Design Review Board recommends adopting the Living Building Challenge as well as the Architecture 2030 Energy Targets for all municipal projects and that for private development the city adopts a minimum green building code modeled after the*

City of Seattle for green building baseline, for a more restrictive green building standard that seeks increased density.

Wilkinson/Gutsche: *The motion carried 7-0.*

New/Old Business

Ron Peltier spoke about the draft Island Wide Transportation plan. He said the proposal sounded harmless but it opened the door to widening the highway. Jim McNett pointed out the difficulty of expanding the highway to four lanes when the bridge was two lanes. Alan Grainger said the proposal seemed to be about speeding up traffic and suggested lowering the speed limit on the highway would help the feeder streets safely enter and exit the highway. Chris Gutsche spoke about the ferry traffic surge phenomena and that he'd hate to see a massive solution to a problem that was only occurring a small percentage of the day. Gondolas and improved massed transit were mentioned as alternative solutions to improve traffic flow. Conversation concluded with Alan Grainger requesting future DRB meetings review projects from 2:00 pm to 4:00 pm and conduct work sessions from 4:00 pm to 5:00 pm.

Motion: I move to adjourn the meeting.

Grainger/Perry: The motion carried 7-0.

Adjourn

The meeting was adjourned at 5:12 pm

Approved by:

Alan Grainger, Chair

Lara Lant, Administrative Specialist

Lara Lant

From: Alan Grainger
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 1:59 PM
To: Jim McNett; Peter Perry; Jeff Boon; Chris Gutsche; Jason Wilkinson; Joseph Dunstan; Lara Lant; Ron Peltier
Subject: RE: Final Draft of the DRB Report to City Council
Attachments: 2016 Annual Report rev1.pdf

Two additional topics added at the prompting of Jim.

- *The DRB believes that it can provide good design advice to the City Council for the upcoming site analysis and selection process for the police/court facility, for example, while creating an opportunity for informative public meetings. To that end the DRB encourages the Council to expand the DRB purview to include public buildings, civic spaces, and facilities.*
- *As island citizens, the DRB find the most common question asked of us is “how did we let that happen?” The issue generating the question is typically the clear cutting as part of new subdivisions reviewed for engineering but not for good creative site design in the neighborhood context. This is another area where the council can extend the purview of the DRB particularly with the introduction of Low Impact Design (LID) in January of 2017.*

Alan

From: [Alan Grainger](#)
Sent: Monday, January 16, 2017 12:53 PM
To: [Jim McNett](#); [Peter Perry](#); [Jeff Boon](#); [Chris Gutsche](#); [Jason Wilkinson](#); [Joseph Dunstan](#); [Lara Lant](#); [Ron Peltier](#)
Subject: Final Draft of the DRB Report to City Council

Dear DRB Members, Lara, and Ron:

Attached please find my Final Draft of the 2016 Annual Report to City Council. Please review this prior to our meeting next Monday January 23rd.

I would like to include your comments and wrap it up at that time.

Lara please add some time after the review of minutes to receive feedback.

Also remember to add our one hour work session to the agenda.

Thanks all

Alan

City of Bainbridge Island Design Review Board

2016 Annual Report to the City Council

The City of Bainbridge Island Design Review Board, CoBI DRB, is made up of seven volunteer citizens:

| | | |
|-------|-----------|----------------|
| Susan | Bergen | Resigned June |
| Jeff | Boon | |
| Chuck | Depew | Resigned June |
| Joe | Dunstan | Appointed July |
| Alan | Grainger | Chair |
| Chris | Gutsche | |
| Jim | McNett | |
| Peter | Perry | |
| Jason | Wilkinson | Appointed July |

With Ron Peltier City Council Liaison

During 2016 the DRB held fifteen meetings, with a total of 240 hours spent by the Board in meetings with roughly a similar commitment of time spent in preparation. The Board was fortunate to have regular attendance by Ron Peltier, our City Council liaison, and benefited from the regular attendance of Charles Schmid, an interested citizen. In the first quarter, the Chair of the DRB attended the interviews for the new Planning Director, and in the second quarter along with Ron Peltier, interviewed the four applicants to fill the two vacant positions resulting from resignations of Chuck Depew and Susan Bergen. Chuck and Susan's service to the board was much appreciated. Very qualified new members, Joseph Dunstan and Jason Wilkinson, filled their positions.

Projects reviewed throughout the year included Historic Preservation, Healthcare, Hospitality, Fire Stations, Schools – public and private, Multifamily, Single Family/HDDP, and Art and Craft Workspace. Spread over the year were City briefings about Open Meetings, Ethics, and in December, an introduction to the new requirements (January 2017) for Low Impact Development. Assistance was also given to an Eagle Scout for a proposed Sign project.

DRB recurring issues over the past year, that we hope will be addressed in 2017, included the apparent unchecked tree removal associated with proposed subdivisions, the lack of post occupancy review (particularly landscape relative to approved documents), the proliferation of sandwich boards in the Winslow core detracting from the pedestrian experience and clear access, and finally ongoing discussions about the DRB process and scope of work.

In their first meeting of 2017 the DRB unanimously passed two motions that stated:

- the top priority in the new Comprehensive Plan must be environmental stewardship to prevent irreversible damage to Bainbridge Island, and
- sustainable design is good design and the DRB recommends adoption of the Living Building Challenge as well as the Architecture 2030 energy targets for all municipal projects, and that for private development the City adopts a minimum green building code modeled after that of the City of Seattle for a green building baseline, and a more restrictive green building standard for those seeking increased density.

2017 Design Review Board Goals

During 2017 the DRB intends to use the prescribed two-hour meeting for project review and to commit an additional hour at each meeting as a DRB work session.

Topics will include:

- creating a new outline structure for the Design Guidelines based on “The Smart Growth Manual”
- reviewing and updating the Design Guidelines within this new framework
- the unaddressed issues of 2016 listed above.

The intent of the first two is to make the Design Guidelines a more user-friendly document that places proposed development within the context of the island.

The DRB will continue to encourage the Planning Department staff to inform prospective applicants that an additional “Concept” conversation with the DRB is a great starting point before the actual Pre-Application process starts. (This does not require any fees nor starts the procedural clock running.)

The DRB can be most effective when Applicants have submitted the appropriate material relative to their position in the process. As such DRB prepared a clear list of submittal materials and will work closely with staff to ensure applications are complete before review begins.

The DRB had significant and positive impact through review of the proposed designs for the new Waterfront Park at the request of the City Council, which resulted in creating a more supportive environment and means for public comment through those meetings.

The DRB believes that it can provide good design advice to the City Council for the upcoming site analysis and selection process for the police/court facility, for example, while creating an opportunity for informative public meetings. To that end the DRB encourages the Council to expand the DRB purview to include public buildings, civic spaces, and facilities.

As island citizens, the DRB find the most common question asked of us is “how did we let that happen?” The issue generating the question is typically the clear cutting as part of new subdivisions reviewed for engineering but not for good creative site design in the neighborhood context. This is another area where the council can extend the purview of the DRB particularly with the introduction of Low Impact Design (LID) in January of 2017.

In conclusion, the Design Review Board is enthusiastic and committed to continuing to serve our community by working to ensure and safeguard the special character of our island home as the island and city grow, evolve, and change.