

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – COBI Police-Court Facility ([PLN51524 PRE](#))
CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure
REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES
PUBLIC COMMENT ON OFF AGENDA ITEMS
DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE PUBLIC HEARING – Review and Recommendation
SPR/CUP DECISION CRITERIA UPDATE – Review and Recommendation
CITY COUNCIL UPDATE
NEW/OLD BUSINESS
ADJOURN

PUBLIC PARTICIPATION MEETING – COBI Police-Court Facility ([PLN51524 PRE](#))
Chair William Chester opened the meeting at 6:03 PM.

CALL TO ORDER – Call to Order, Agenda Review, Conflict Disclosure

Chair William Chester called the meeting to order at 7:03 PM. Planning Commissioners in attendance were J. Mack Pearl, Jon Quitslund, Lisa Macchio, Kimberly McCormick Osmond, Don Doman and Joe Paar. City Councilor Sarah Blossom was present. City Staff present were Interim Planning Director Heather Wright, Acting Interim Planning Manager Kelly Tayara, Long Range Senior Planner Jennifer Sutton, Planner Ellen Fairleigh, and Administrative Specialist Carla Lundgren who monitored recording and prepared minutes.

The agenda was reviewed. There were not any conflicts noted.

REVIEW AND APPROVE MINUTES – August 8 and 22, 2019

Motion: I move approval of the meeting minutes from the special meeting on August 8, 2019.

Quitslund/Pearl: Passed Unanimously

Motion: I move approval of the meeting minutes from the special meeting on August 22, 2019.

Quitslund/Pearl: Passed Unanimously

PUBLIC COMMENT ON OFF AGENDA ITEMS

None.

DESIGN GUIDELINES UPDATE PUBLIC HEARING – Review and Recommendation
Long Range Senior Planner Jennifer Sutton facilitated discussion.

The Public Hearing opened at 7:08pm.

Sarah Blossom, City Council Member and liaison for the Historic Preservation

Commission: Ms. Blossom provided feedback from the Historic Preservation Commission. The HPC has concerns that the new design guidelines in Ericksen and Fort Ward will make it easier for new development to come in. The HPC has requested involvement in the design review process in historic areas like Ericksen and Fort Ward.

The Public Hearing closed at 9:16pm.

Motion: We'd like to recommend approval of Ordinance No. 2019-25 as amended to include only the draft Section 1 and draft Section 7, as modified to change the last sentence in Section 7 to "in the event of a conflict between two or more design standards or regulations, the 2019 Design for Bainbridge shall apply." All other existing portions of the draft ordinance would be deleted. We further move to recommend approval of the document Design for Bainbridge 2019, as revised during our Planning Commission discussion.

Osmond/Quitslund: Passed Unanimously

SPR/CUP DECISION CRITERIA UPDATE – Review and Recommendation

Moved to next available meeting date due to time constraints.

CITY COUNCIL UPDATE

Interim Planning & Community Development Director Heather Wright provided a synopsis of Council activity of interest to the Planning Commission.

NEW/OLD BUSINESS

None.

ADJOURN

The meeting was adjourned at 9:35pm.

Approved by:


William Chester, Chair


Carla Lundgren, Administrative Specialist

September 3, 2019

TO: Planning Commissioners; Jennifer Sutton and Heather Wright

FROM: Jon Quitslund

Having been out of town last week, I just picked up the agenda packet for Thursday's meeting this morning. I have been working my way through the Decision Criteria, which still need some patient attention. I realized when I came to the "Additional Decision Criteria" on p. 5 that I had not looked at that subsection (G.) with any care. There's a lot of room for improvement!

Please consider this reorganization of subsection G:

G. Additional Criteria for Institutions in Residential Zones. In addition to the criteria in subsection F, applications to locate in residential zones any facility categorized in BIMC Table 18.09.020 as educational, governmental, religious, health care, club, or cultural shall be processed as major conditional use permits and required to meet the following criteria:

1. The site must front on a road classified in the Island-Wide Transportation Plan as residential suburban, collector, or arterial; and
2. If the traffic study shows an adverse impact on the level of service, the impact shall be mitigated as required by the city engineer; and
3. The scale of any proposed construction or modification, including bulk and height and architectural style, is consistent with the neighborhood; and
4. If the facility will have fewer than 50 attendees and employees or seat fewer than 50 in an assembly area, the director may waive any of the above requirements in this subsection G, but not those required elsewhere in the BIMC; and
5. Except for public schools and governmental facilities as defined in BIMC Title 18, lot coverage shall not exceed 50 percent of the amount allowed in the pertinent zoning district. Except in the R-0.4 zoning district, public schools and governmental facilities shall be allowed 100 percent of the lot coverage in the pertinent district, and in the R-0.4 district, up to 150%, provided that in any district, conditions required by the director to mitigate impacts of the use may limit the allowable lot coverage.

Details in #5 above raise a question. Table 18.09.020 does not mention either "public" or "private" schools; the category is "Educational Facility." Is it appropriate to treat public and private schools differently with regard to lot coverage? Private schools are different in the number of students they serve and therefore in the lot coverage needed, but should they be limited to 50% of the lot coverage allowed for a residence or residences?