

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)
Review and Approval of Minutes – March 2, 2020
Fraik Short Plat ([PLN51709 DRB](#))
KBA Short Plat ([PLN51711 DRB-DG](#))
Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA/SPRA)
New/Old Business
Adjourn

Call to Order (Attendance, Agenda, Ethics)

Chair Joseph Dunstan called the meeting to order at 2:01 PM. Design Review Board members in attendance were Jane Rein, Michael Loverich, Todd Theil, Shawn Parks, Vicki Clayton and Laurel Wilson. Planning Commissioner Jon Quitslund was present. City Council member Leslie Schneider was present. City Staff present were Planning Manager David Greetham, Senior Planner Kelly Tayara, Associate Planner Ellen Fairleigh, Administrative Specialist Jane Rasely and Administrative Specialist Marlene Schubert who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. No conflicts were disclosed.

Review and Approval of Minutes – March 2, 2020

Motion: I move to approve.

Loverich/Rein: Passed Unanimously

Fraik Short Plat ([PLN51709 DRB](#))

Conceptual Review Meeting – Review only

KBA Short Plat ([PLN51711 DRB-DG](#))

Design Guidance Review Meeting (type of meeting corrected from agenda)

Discussion only

Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA/SPRA)

Confirm Recommendation for Planning Commission – Ellen Fairleigh, Planner

See attached Design for Bainbridge Final Design Review-PLN51524 CUPA SPRA 05182020

Motion: I move that the DRB approve the Police & Court Facility without conditions.

Rein/Loverich: Passed Unanimously

Attendee Report

Report Generated:	5/19/2020 7:47			
Topic	Webinar ID	Actual Start Time	Actual Duration (minutes)	# Registered
Design Review Board - Special Meeting	918 5982 4040	5/18/2020 13:36		189
			Unique Viewers	Total Users
				13
				42

Host Details

User Name	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)
mschubert@bainbridgewa.gov	mschubert@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 13:36	5/18/2020 16:44	189

Panelist Details

User Name	Email	Join Time	Leave Time	Time in Session (minutes)
Jane Rasely	jrasely@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 13:45	5/18/2020 16:44	179
Joe Dunstan	joseph.dunstan@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:44	5/18/2020 16:44	181
laurel wilson	laurel@arcstudio.com	5/18/2020 14:03	5/18/2020 16:44	162
Jane Rein	jane.rein@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:47	5/18/2020 16:44	178
charlie	charlie@wenzlauarchitects.com	5/18/2020 14:51	5/18/2020 15:53	62
Robert Hutchinson	hutchinsonrobertharry@hotmail.com	5/18/2020 16:01	5/18/2020 16:39	39
Vicki Clayton	vicki.clayton@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:50	5/18/2020 14:01	11
Vicki Clayton	vicki.clayton@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 14:01	5/18/2020 16:44	164
Shawn Parks	shawn.parks@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:53	5/18/2020 16:44	171
Ellen Fairleigh	efairleigh@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 13:48	5/18/2020 16:44	177
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:59	5/18/2020 15:41	102
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 15:42	5/18/2020 16:03	21
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 16:05	5/18/2020 16:08	4
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 16:07	5/18/2020 16:23	16
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 16:23	5/18/2020 16:35	13
Todd Thiel	todd.thiel@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 16:31	5/18/2020 16:44	14
matthew	matthew@coatesdesign.com	5/18/2020 16:00	5/18/2020 16:39	39
Kelly Tayara	ktayara@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 15:37	5/18/2020 16:44	67
Michael Loverich	michael.loverich@cobicommittee.email	5/18/2020 13:52	5/18/2020 16:44	173
David Greetham	dgreetham@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 13:53	5/18/2020 16:44	172
Barry Loveless	bloveless@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 15:54	5/18/2020 16:39	45
Leslie Schneider	LSchneider@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 13:57	5/18/2020 16:44	167

Attendee Details

User Name	Email	Registration Time	Join Time
Nikki Wheeler	nikki@brownwheeler.com	5/18/2020 13:55	5/18/2020 14:00
Bob Russell	bobrussell169@gmail.com	5/18/2020 13:58	5/18/2020 14:01
laurel wilson	laurel@arcstudio.com	5/18/2020 13:39	5/18/2020 14:01
charlie	charlie@wenzlauarchitects.com	5/18/2020 14:01	5/18/2020 14:01
charlie	charlie@wenzlauarchitects.com		5/18/2020 15:53
Michael Pollock	mpollock@bainbridewas.gov	5/18/2020 14:01	5/18/2020 14:01

User Name	Email	Registration Time	Join Time
Robert Hutchinson	hutchinsonrobertharry@hotmail.com	5/18/2020 13:33	5/18/2020 14:01
Robert Hutchinson	hutchinsonrobertharry@hotmail.com		5/18/2020 16:39
matthew	matthew@coatesdesign.com	5/18/2020 15:37	5/18/2020 15:37
jonquitslund	jonquitslund@att.net	5/18/2020 14:06	5/18/2020 14:06
jonquitslund	jonquitslund@att.net		5/18/2020 14:35
Robert	bfraik@gmail.com	5/18/2020 13:59	5/18/2020 14:01
Barry Loveless	bloveless@bainbridgewa.gov	5/18/2020 14:32	5/18/2020 14:32
Barry Loveless	bloveless@bainbridgewa.gov		5/18/2020 16:39
Adam Wheeler	adam@brownwheeler.com	5/18/2020 13:54	5/18/2020 14:01
Lisa Neal	neal4law@yahoo.com	5/18/2020 14:08	5/18/2020 14:08
Kelly	kellysamson60@gmail.com	5/18/2020 14:13	5/18/2020 14:13
Kelly	kellysamson60@gmail.com		5/18/2020 14:19
Kelly	kellysamson60@gmail.com		5/18/2020 14:49



DESIGN REVIEW BOARD FINAL DESIGN REVIEW Bainbridge Island, Washington

PROJECT: COBI Police Court Facility (PLN51524 CUPA SPRA)
DATE: May 18, 2020
PROJECT PLANNER: Ellen Fairleigh
Design Review Board Meeting Dates: 06/03/2019 (Design Guidance); 12/02/2019 (Review & Recommendation); 03/02/2020 (Confirm Review & Recommendation)

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. Project will require a conditional use permit. It's an institution/government facility in the R8, which is a residential district.

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: Project meets S1 through S5.

Site Design Discussion:

1. Should the ecological report demonstrate that the addition to the building is functionally isolated from the critical area, then the following DRB determination stands. Otherwise, the proposal will return to the DRB for further review.
2. Project proposal is an existing building. New addition(s) are small and will not impact natural systems.
3. Exterior landscaping remains the same.
4. There would be no changes to any hardscape for the parking other than there will be a secure parking area in the back for police use. While this parking will be fenced, it will not be seen by people entering the front.
5. Existing parking remains unchanged and is for the public and a few staff positions.
6. There is a designated critical area on site.
7. All landscape areas disturbed during construction will be replanted and enhanced.
8. Bike Storage racks are included for the public
9. S5 - Security concerns for visitors: it was noted that there might be security concerns walking from the bus stop on Madison to the court facility. See Public Realm discussion.
10. Regarding ADA walks; all sidewalks and concrete walks are ADA compliant and will not change.
11. There is a trail behind the building that is gravel and is referenced and required in the land title for a connection to Sakai. It has no programmatic relevance to this project.

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:

1. Project meets Standards P1 through P5
2. Standard P6 is not applicable to this project as proposed.

Public Realm Discussion:

1. P1 - Bike racks will be located at building front entrance.
2. P1 - Safety: A bus stop is located at Madison Avenue with a short walk uphill to the facility. Safety was a concern. People who show up for restraining orders ought to feel safe walking to the courts. A person has to walk up the street and the person she/he is trying to get a restraining order on can drive right up the same street and they are exposed. This was not resolved as it was deemed outside of the project by the design team.
3. P2 - "Minimize the impact of vehicles on the public realm": This facility by function is auto-oriented. It was stated that traffic generated by the proposed use would be similar to or less than that of the previous use as a health care facility. There are no planned changes or enlargements to the existing parking or access points/circulation
4. P2 - Noise from police sirens: It was stated by the design team that 85 - 90% of the time, officers are not on the site when they get a call. They are out on patrol. In addition, officers do not generally turn the sirens on until they are in traffic or intersections. Therefore, noise from sirens are expected to be minimal.
5. P3 - "Design to support a legible hierarchy of public spaces." Existing building accomplishes this well. When you drive up the street there, you know where the entry is. You know where the building is. This is very successful. No changes to existing circulation, drive entry, or front door are proposed.
6. P4 - "Strengthen public space connection" New development shall have careful attention to how the building will interact with public realms. The building is

connected by existing roads and parking and sidewalks. Existing building and proposed remodel stand alone.

7. P4 - Public Space: A court and police facility should have a certain amount of significance or signaling there that this is an important public or civic building now. A well defined public space with a flagpole and lighting/benches would accomplish this. There is an existing small plaza in front of the building that is well landscaped with benches. A good place for a flagpole, sign and lighting.
8. P5 and P6: Discussion of "Departure from standards" or "Not Applicable": The project meets two of the guidelines in standard P5, where the intent is to create a pedestrian oriented design that is safe and allows travel through the site. There is an existing walking path that will be maintained that connects to other sites. The building is existing and while a stand alone structure, is scaled to fit between the church and the senior living center. It "breaks down the massing of the building the scale of long façades to fit the rhythm of the surrounding block." The small plaza and front entry at scaled for people. COBI planning staff believes a departure has to relate to a variance from a standard in the municipal code that impacts the applicants ability to meet the design standard.
9. P6 - This project is a civic building not a commercial building and is not located on a commercial street. Therefore, standard P6 does not apply.

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: Project meets standards B1 through B5.

Building Design Discussion:

1. Original building is 17,000 SF. The program for the police and courts requires 24,000 SF. The design team was able to bring the program inline with existing SF with two small additions.

2. As a police and court building “bullet resistivity requirement” becomes very important in terms of windows, bullet resistant glazing and exterior materials. Existing wood comes off and bullet resistant material will be used. Smaller windows will be used on first floor. From a character standpoint, these are the elements that changes the most on the building.
3. B1 - Clear and organizing concept: Existing building has a distinct concept to it. The remodel will keep the circulation pattern and entry. The remodel has a pretty clear and organizing concept.
4. B2 - Existing building did not borrow from nearby buildings, but is a stand alone structure that looked distinctive and different.
5. B3 - “Well composed facades at all scales.” Existing building, exterior materials have been revised. See discussion on standard P3 above. There is some human scale to this building.
6. B3 - “Integrate utilities and service functions into the architectural concept, screening mechanical equipment and trash can facilities from view”: Trash and recycling are located in the back of the building. The nearest neighbor is the Madrona House and by putting it across the site, there will be less impact on the Madrona house residents.
7. B4 - “Celebrate and prominently feature sustainable design”. The Comp Plan calls for sustainable design. Building exterior will be metal materials. Metal siding and roofing are always a recyclable material. Architect stated that they do everything they can within a normal budget to accomplish what we can but terms of a sustainability there has not been a goal set for that on this project. It was pointed out that top priorities for 2019 for the climate action plan and green energy code creates an opportunity for the city to be great leaders here in terms of sustainability. Especially with a project that intended to protect and maintain safety and security for the whole island.
8. B5 - “High quality materials and well crafted design”: Existing wood siding will be replaced as the building needs to be essentially bulletproof. Building will be armored and the building needs to meet “essential facility” structural requirements. It will require shear diaphragms to structurally re-enforce the building. Therefore, the window configuration will change and become smaller. Exterior will be a box rib - a variation of thick and thin. There will be no pattern and from the road you will see this new material. Everything else is essentially the same. First floor windows got a little smaller.
9. Utilities: No communications structures will be on the roof or surrounding area. That includes any towers or microwaves.

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: Project meets standards L1 through L-6

Landscape Discussion:

1. All existing landscaping will be maintained and where impacted by building construction, replaced and enhanced.
2. Green infrastructure: There is an existing back-parking lot that is pervious pavement. There is a rain garden that will be maintained.

STREET TYPES AND FRONTAGES

Street Type: State Route

Findings: Project meets street type and frontage

Discussion:

During the Design Review Board Meeting in December, this was discussed and only state routes would apply. The vegetated buffer would be the only guideline that applies. The police/court is not changing its vegetated buffer along the state route. Rural by Design did not apply.

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: Standard 1 is not applicable. Project meets Standard 2.

Larger Sites Discussion:

STANDARD 1: This standard is not applicable; the standard relates to clustering buildings and frontages. This is existing project does not have this. The building is existing, nothing is being changed that is impactive to the neighborhood.

STANDARD 2: This standard has been met; the parking is not visible until you enter the parking lot. The existing parking is not changing and does not impact the public realm.

CIVIC USES

STANDARD1 DESIGN CIVIC USES AND SITES TO REFLECT AND CONTRIBUTE TO THEIR FUNCTION AND ROLE IN THE COMMUNITY WHILE BEING CLEARLY INDENTIFIABLE AS A CIVIC USE.

STANDARD2 DESIGN CIVIC SITES AND BUILDINGS TO SERVE MULTIPLE FUNCTIONS SUCH AS PUBLIC SPACE, COMMUNITY GATHERINGS, PUBLIC ART, AND OTHER COMPATIBLE USES.

Civic Uses Findings:

Project meets Standard 1. Project meets Standard 2 with an indoor and outdoor public gathering area.

Civic Uses Discussion:

Standard 1) The building was not originally designed as a civic building. It becomes clear it is a public building because of police/court signage, flagpole. Civic buildings are generally in the downtown area. In this case, city council chose this building and it is outside the purview of the Design Review Board. Civic signage is important. Three signs are proposed: one on the building addressing SR305, one at Madison Ave intersection and a monument sign as you enter the project site.

