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Vision for Eastsound: Purpose of Document

Change over time is inevitable. Change can improve or degrade the existing situation, but either way can be an uncomfortable transition for some. This document is an invitation to engage in influencing the change in ways that you see as positive.

The population of San Juan County increased 57% in the twenty years between the 1990 and 2010 census. Orcas Island population is up about 24% from the 2000 census. The San Juan County forecasts suggest that Orcas population will reach over 7000 by 2025 and straight lining that to the end of a twenty year planning horizon would suggest over 8000 by 2035.

Similarly, projected housing needs on Orcas show a need for over 1500 units by 2035 at least half of which must be accommodated in the Eastsound urban growth area.

Just as important to the future, tourism is dramatically up as indicated by the nearly 16% increase in ferry ridership (Anacortes/Orcas) and 24% increase in sales tax revenue (unincorporated San Juan County) in three years (2011-2014) and 83% increase in lodging tax revenue (Orcas only, 2009-2015). This phenomenal rate of growth is probably fueled in part by broad changes in societal travel patterns in an era of terrorism threats and by the economic engine of growth in the northwest, particularly Seattle. While not likely to continue at these rates it is likely to remain higher than previously seen and represents significant pressure on Eastsound’s ability to cope.

The graph on the following page plots these trends. Please note the varying scales for each. The relevance is more in the consistent upward slope than in the comparison of population to visits to dollars etc.
This inevitable growth can happen haphazardly or it can be influenced by a stakeholder\textsuperscript{1} vision of what could be and planning, regulations, attitudes and programs which support such a vision. \textbf{The purpose of a vision is to influence and shape the future change.}

The San Juan County Comprehensive Plan has this to say about Vision for the Future:

“Visions allow people to dream and look into the future; they give us a chance to imagine what our community can become at its best.

Vision planning asks people from all walks of life to think about the future and what they would like it to become, and then figure out ways to make it happen.

In the simplest terms, a vision is a consensus image of what a community seeks to become. Adopted as a formal policy statement, a vision serves both as a blueprint for future direction and a yardstick against which to measure current decisions and actions.”

This document is intended to inform and enrich a stakeholder dialogue on the long range future (20 years from now, more or less) of the village of Eastsound. It was created through

\textsuperscript{1} A stakeholder is anyone with a strong interest in the future of Eastsound whether island resident, landowner, business owner or employee, visitor or other
the efforts of a task group created by the Eastsound Planning Review Committee co-chaired by Greg Ayers and Bob Maynard (see last page for list of all participants).

The dreams illustrated in this document are those that stakeholders have expressed either in public meetings, letters to news media or private interviews. That dream set has been supplemented by a few others that members of the task group felt relevant to consider. The task group is not advocating for any particular ideas, but rather has viewed its responsibility as one of illustrator of stakeholder ideas and possible consequences. The Group hopes that seeing and understanding these ideas will spawn even better ones.

The document is in three parts: analysis of what exists, ideas and dreams illustrated and 3 example scenarios of how these dreams might combine with different emphasis.
Part One:

Analysis of Village Core

The Quarter Mile Radius

A widely accepted metric for a walking neighborhood or village is a quarter mile radius. Assuming a centroid for Eastsound Village at the center of the county owned right of way for Fern Street in the center between Prune Alley and North Beach Road the following diagram shows the extent of the nominal core of the village.
Eastsound Village Core with quarter mile radius

Notable in this is that it includes most of the services one would hope for in a village core including schools, parks, churches and convenience stores. Some services, however are just outside of this radius including daycare (barely outside) and medical and emergency services (walkable for the fully abled, but a bit far for others). Most notable however is the very few housing units within this core (50-60). A more viable density for street life and walk to work would be 3-4 times that many. There is high demand for resident low income in-village housing, some demand for market rate in-village housing (resident and non-resident) and short supply of both.

A few residences are currently under construction within the core and more are planned just outside of it.

There are approximately 1200 parking spaces (both private and public) within the core, and some perception of parking shortage at peak visitor times.

There are occasional traffic back-ups, particularly at the 3 way stop signed intersection of Main and North Beach.
A Pluralistic Village

Eastsound has a pluralistic existence, serving a variety of roles in the Orcas and San Juan County communities:

- **Hometown** to Orcas with all of the attendant community pride and sense of belonging
- **Marketplace** to Orcas and neighboring islands, both in the sense of day to day commerce and services and in the special sense of the seasonal outdoor market
- **Celebration** place year round, hosting parades and festivals
- **Wedding Venue** with waterfront photo spots
- **Leisure Tourist Destination**, seasonal yet a primal engine for the Orcas economy
- **Festival Venue** for arts, crafts, food, theatre, birds and very importantly music
- **Support Base** for bikers, hikers, campers, and to a lesser extent boaters and fly-ins.
- **Seasonal** in that the spring through fall tourist influx (and the operations of service providers relative to that) make the character of Eastsound much more urban during that period than it is in the winter months.
- **Topographically/Geographically defined** by the significant hills to the east and west, the saltwater bodies North and South, and particularly its position at the head of the Sound.
- **Meeting place** for social gatherings from a few friends to many participants.
- **Services Center** for health, fire and rescue, power, communication
- **Schools site** for the entire island.
- **Church base** for multiple faiths.
- **Port of entry** (to the island) for land based air traffic and to a minor extent boats.
- **Village like** with few large scale buildings, side yards, open green spaces and many trees.
- **An early 20th century feel**, laid back and intimate.
- **Attractive at the Main Street Ferry Road approach** with the park, the sound and attractive buildings, particularly the first house, the Outlook Inn and the Episcopal Church.
- **Attractive in profile from the water** (and the county dock) in large part because of the number of white gable ended buildings.
Understanding Eastsound as it presently exists

These simple birds-eye diagrams illustrate Eastsound as it appears today. At first blush, there doesn’t seem to be an organizing principal or logic, as to how the village came to be what it is, and how it is experienced.

On closer inspection, there are basic organizing principles that have existed from the beginning and upon which the village has grown over time. They are the primary roads (Main, North Beach, and Prune Alley), and the waterfront.
Add to this major nodes, or points of interest (the library, the village green and museum, the primary retail intersections, and the waterfront park). These are some of the things that animate one’s experience of Eastsound for both residents and guests.

The movement between these nodes (and many other specific destinations around town) add to and begin to map the walking experience of Eastsound on a daily basis.

With these simple and intuitive observations one begins to appreciate what animates the village today, and is the basis of much of its delight. As future growth and change occur inevitably, how do we encourage a thoughtful approach that is most likely to heighten rather than dilute these qualities?
What follows are another series of simple diagrams that delve into the village zones or “neighborhoods” illustrating the rich interplay of the parts that make up the whole.

To begin with the venerable public assets and institutions, no matter how modest, create the cultural landscape of the village. These include: museum, library, post office, schools and churches.

Commercial activities like shops and restaurants provide the economic engine of the village and lively experience for residents and guests.
Add to this in-town residences which are vital to a true village.

Finally, public outdoor space like the shoreline, the village green, the library park and the various wetlands enrich the community and fill out the experience of Eastsound.

Taken together these four categories: Civic and Cultural, Commercial, Residential, and Recreational, compose one way of understanding the village presently.

How will these zones and intersections become richer in time? Are they even important or would mixing them together be more dynamic?
And perhaps most important, what’s missing? Would additional inns and hotels be beneficial? Many have suggested more in-town housing such as apartments above first floor retail spaces. Live/work spaces would attract artists and craftsmen, and potentially professionals capable of telecommuting from the cities. And more paths and wetlands would add to the walking experience and manage run-off water. Car parking will continue to challenge village atmosphere weighed against guest and resident convenience. Should there be parking lots at the edges of downtown? Should there be fewer dead end streets? Should height limits and density limits stay the same? Should new buildings be designed to address the character of what’s best about the old?

**Visual Analysis of Village Core**

This section attempts to illustrate a number of specific attributes, presently observable in Eastsound that may inform ongoing discussion and consensus-building about desirable Character and Design guidelines. Hopefully the intent of guidelines will not be to impose onerous restrictions and limitations, but inspire great planning and design, both traditional and contemporary, in such a way as to enhance the already delightful village of Eastsound.

Both positive and negative attributes are offered to illuminate, through shared experience, what enhances and what detracts from all that our community and guests have come to cherish about Eastsound. The hope is to better articulate what most understand intuitively, and in doing so, make character and design decisions more informed, less mysterious, and as straightforward as possible.

Initially identified attributes are organized as follows:

Positive:  
- comfortable ambiguity between the public and private realm
- anticipation / gratification
- generous privacy
- modulation
- termination
- intimate scale
- modest paths
- simple parking
delight

Negative:
false generosity
monotony
deflation of experience
contrived parking

Missing:
   focal point / landmark
   blending of quality new with quality old
comfortable ambiguity between the public and private realm

“One walking experience leads to the next, almost without a decision.”

“One moves comfortably from sidewalk to private space.”
“It is private, but one feels welcomed.”

“The private path is as generous as the public sidewalk.”
“Is it a pavilion in a park, or a shop, one almost don’t care which.”

anticipation / gratification

“A bend in the road — one approaches town but doesn’t see it, then it’s here!”
“One wonders how to get to the shoreline, then finds a path.”

generous privacy

“One won’t enter here, but it gives back to the village experience.”
“Village touches the rural.”

“To see this private residence is to remember why one comes to Eastsound.”
“One doesn’t share in this experience directly, and yet, somehow, you do.”

modulation

“A larger building becomes a series of smaller experiences, without trying too hard.”
“What could have been a single, larger building became three, and gave back variety plus a courtyard.”

“Modulation of buildings and land, of exposed and hidden.”
"The termination of a street with a building helps orientation; with a symmetrical building, no matter how modest, it lends a sense of traditional town planning."

"Even a fine building, less than properly placed, doesn't work as well."
“If somewhat monumental, the terminus becomes a significant landmark. If too pronounced, it stands apart rather than contributing to the whole.”

intimate scale

“Modesty is one of the building-blocks of village aesthetic.”
“The presence of the house-in-town reinforces village intimacy.”

“The occasional side yard lends generosity and visual respite without lessening retail vitality.”
“Unlike the city, small-scale pedestrian experience is often better than large-scale.”

“A narrow sidewalk is experienced as a path, with a sense of discovery.”
“The path might lead anywhere.”

simple parking

“Simple, intuitive parking doesn’t detract from village experience as much as one might expect.”
“Park where you want, park where you can, is less contrived.”

“Parking can actually signify welcome.”
Delight

“Simple beauty.”
“The blending of nature—near and far—and the built environment.”

“The found moment.”
false generosity

“Though nicely landscaped, this building hides from the street, and is therefore less than welcoming. It does not actively participate in the village.”

“Retail with very little to offer back to the street.”
“Though articulated with pleasing detail, the formality and symmetry of these buildings emphasize the parking behind where one might have expected a lovely square. The monumentality feels curious and misplaced.”

monotony

“Lack of modulation of: light, scale, color, and texture makes for anemic experience.”
“The visual is no more enticing than the experiential.”

“Though modulated, effort to subdivide the façade is unconvincing and so the complex lacks flavor from the street.”
deflation of experience

“The village ends before it’s done.”

“Missing buildings are like missing teeth in the walking/exploring experience.”
"Near the village center, there is absence of focal point that typically denotes a center."

contrived parking

"Though fenced and landscaped, surface parking lots are anathema to village character."
“No one comes to Orcas Island for this! Convenience is of highest priority in the suburbs, but may be ruinous to the village.”

focal point / landmark

“A new focal point at a privileged location within the village.”
blending of quality new with quality old

“The way Eastsound village looks and feels from afar.”

“There are many examples of contemporary architecture that are harmonious with tradition. They need not be at odds.”
Part Two

Precepts: Dreams Illustrated

The following are precepts* (ideas/dreams illustrated) based on the multitude of ideas expressed by Eastsound stakeholders over the last year or so, starting with the public meeting sponsored by EPRC and the Chamber of Commerce in March of 2015. Added to these were comments written to Orcas Issues and the Sounder, and ideas expressed by numerous stakeholders in individual interviews. Some ideas were also added by task group members to supplement the set where there were thought to be missing pieces.

These precepts have been categorized for ease of assigning development responsibility within the task group and for ease of reference, but the categories have no other significance.

The task group has attempted to be objective in their depiction of these ideas both in manner of illustration and presentation of whys and why nots. The different styles of presentation are a reflection of the differences among task group members, who span a couple of generations.

There are no doubt other stakeholder ideas that should be included in the dialogue and anyone who has an idea they would like to have illustrated is encouraged to contact the task group.

A list of the stakeholder concerns and ideas that have driven this effort is included as an appendix at the end of this document.

*precept is used here as it is in design practice to denote the initial visual representation of an idea, not a specific design proposal
• **Amenities/ Ethos**

Stakeholders have praised the ethos of Eastsound as caring, friendly and welcoming. The Ethos of a place comes from the attitudes and beliefs of its inhabitants and their investment in those attitudes and beliefs. An Article in the May 2016 issue of Seattle Magazine (which included Eastsound as one of eight perfect small town getaways) described it as having “a slow and friendly vibe”. The physical manifestation of the ethos is expressed in the appearance of the place and the amenities it provides.

Following is a list of precepts in this category:

- Select/Retain Deputy County Manager for Orcas
- Aquatic Center
- Increase Public Restrooms
- Homage to April
- Increase Amenities
- Orcas Art Museum
- Tromp L’oeil Facades
- Complimentary Driving School
Leadership/Management for Orcas/Eastsound

Select/Retain Deputy County Manager for Orcas

Add an advocate, leader and overseer for the issues critical to the future of Orcas, full time, adequately paid and qualified

(Any resemblance of these characters to actual candidates for the position is purely coincidental)

Why Do it?

- Orcas and Eastsound currently struggles to get things done without focal leadership
- Such a leader could cut across the governmental, institutional, private sector divides
- Could add to the ethos of Orcas/Eastsound of a place where things needed can actually happen

Why not Do it?

- Requires an ongoing investment of tax dollars and county government support
- Likely triggers a similar demand from Lopez (good? Bad?)
- Could be a bureaucratic layer if not done correctly
- Maybe there are better alternatives... administration through the Chamber of Commerce or the Eastsound Planning Review Committee?
Addition to Buck Park

Aquatic Center

Add a public aquatic center to Buck Park to serve all island residents and school swimming programs (swimming, diving, recreational, instructional and competitive, training, etc.)

Why Do it?
- Adds a major amenity enjoyed by other similar sized communities
- Reinforces Buck Park as a year-round center for youth and family activity

Why not Do it?
- Requires a multi-million dollar investment
- Requires maintenance and program support
- Commits an important site
Add Convenience

Increase Public Restrooms

There is only one public (gender segregated) restroom available now, placing a lot of pressure on semi-public facilities, especially in high summer season. Additional (probably unisex) facilities at high profile close-in locations would be very welcome.

Why Do it?

- Provides convenience for visitors and residents
- If located conveniently would relieve pressure on existing public and semi-public facilities
- Could be part of parking initiative (co-location with parking clusters)

Why not Do it?

- Requires capital expense
- Requires significant maintenance and surveillance
Century Tel

Homage to April

Century Tel expands service to community by becoming plinth for locally crafted April statue

Why Do it?

- Modifies an unattractive part of Village
- Many would find it interesting/amusing
- Would draw visitors west of North Beach
- A myth in the making
- Gives Century Tel more reason to think about Orcas

Why not Do it?

- Many would find it absurd
- April may not be best choice for celebration
- One liner that is soon tiresome
- Commits an important site that might have more useful purpose
- Could give patrons of lower tavern a problem with reality
Benches, Picnic Tables and Bike Racks

Increase Amenities

There are many benches now, mostly provided by business owners, there are picnic tables, mostly on public land, and there are three bike rack sets, two on public land. These can be increased significantly on public land.

Why Do it?

- Sitting and outdoor eating places are inadequate now, more so soon
- Adds to walking friendliness of Village
- Bike parking needs more capacity and locations

Why not Do it?

- Capital investment required
- Requires finding appropriate locations, consumes space
Add Attraction supporting fine art

Orcas Art Museum

Create a museum for contemporary art in Eastsound.

Why Do it?

- Adds a major amenity enjoyed by other similar sized communities
- Provides opportunity to attract regional, national and international art
- Enhances Orcas commitment to the arts
- Could be another visitor draw
- Could make an existing building a more interesting part of village

Why not Do it?

- Requires an organizational structure
- Requires a large investment
- Requires maintenance and program support
- Likely inadequate population base to support
Cure for the least attractive

**Tromp L’oeil* Facades**

Encourage problematic buildings to implement well-crafted Tromp L’oeil facades, until they are replaced by design conforming buildings.

![Existing Tromp L’oeil painted and new canopy](image)

**Why Do it?**

- Provides immediate significant change
- Would likely create both curiosity and artistic interest
- Could offer a vision of things to come
- Relatively inexpensive way of achieving dramatic change in Village scape

**Why not Do it?**

- Requires willing property owners
- Property selection (other than self-selection) difficult
- Requires very talented muralists

*Tromp L’oeil is a French term used in art and architecture which literally means “fool the eye”, it is pronounced“ tromp loy”*
Adjustment for public safety

Complimentary Driving School

Provide free adult refresher course for Orcas drivers covering advanced concepts such as two way traffic, traffic lanes, the meaning of double yellow lines, the skill of navigating blind corners and safe behavior when encountering octagonal red signs emblazoned with STOP at road intersections.

Why Do it?

• It is badly needed
• Could greatly improve safety of all road users
• A big improvement in island ethos

Why not Do it?

• Those most in need may be most in denial
• Requires program support
• Could provoke a defiant backlash
Design character is one of the most difficult things to influence. It is determined by individual property developers and business owners. It can be constrained by design Standards which can limit outrageous design (good or bad) but these do not ensure the qualities that we might desire. Mandatory design review is another approach used in many jurisdictions, but that is only as good as the reviewers and their interchange with the developer and can be polarizing.

If an ethos of quality design can be evolved in the community developers will likely see benefit in increased business, property values and customer satisfaction and the community will benefit in enjoyment, pride and sense of place.

The overall character – the look and feel of Eastsound – is reflective of its particular history. How it looks and feels in the future will be a reflection of our priorities as a community. How intentional shall our community be with respect to how the Village grows over time?

Following is a list of community precepts related to this question:

- Add color standards: white along waterfront, grey, white color elsewhere?
- Add allowance for contemporary design shed roofs, low pitch 1 ½-2:12
- Encourage street facing balconies, porches
- Reconsider 35’ height limit north of Rose Street
- Enable contemporary architecture of quality
- Create a “village core” zone? (Essentially exists as Village Commercial so modify?)
- Make the Prune Aly to North Beach Road corridor a special design zone
- Reward/encourage development of a few architectural icons
- Eastsound ‘Seaside Village Esthetic
  - BUILDINGS
  - STOREFRONTS
  - STREETSCAPE
Add color standards: white based along waterfront? Dark grey roofs? Grey, white color standard everywhere?

There are villages in the world that have become iconic due to the uniformity of their architecture: Santorini, Greece; Kyoto, Japan; or the adobe structures of Santa Fe for example. Often in the San Juans folks reference and borrow from the New England “cape cod” or the Maine “salt box” vernacular. Is there a unique character within Eastsound to be built upon, with the goal of eventually reaching a recognizable and unique esthetic for the Village? The white gable-roofed waterfront structures, including the church, suggest one possible direction. Encouraging use of local building materials (douglas fir, cedar, madrone) and discouraging synthetic or faux materials is another.
Why do it?

- Possibility to define a “northwest coastal vernacular” design typology (distinct from such styles as the new England “cape cod” or the Maine “salt box”)
- Potential for strong identity/sense of place over time
- Potential for strong tourist identification with the Village, resulting in increased tourist traffic

Why not do it?

- Possible ‘Disneyfication’ of the Village
- Get it wrong and the Village could be viewed as derivative, pastiche or inauthentic (a la Roche Harbor’s retro craftsman theme)
Add allowance for contemporary design shed roofs, low pitch 1 ½-2:12

Roof pitch is regulated within the Village to 6:12 minimum gable-style, with minor areas of flat or shed elements (such as the dormers on the liquor store). Allowing alternatives to this roof type would require a change in the zoning code.

Why do it?

- Allows greater variety within the Village (if variety is the desire vs. unity)
- Allows for viable third story with good floor to floor height
- Low-slope roofs would allow for the inclusion of garden roofs, which mitigate storm-water

Why not do it?

- Could create possibility for too much variety within the Village (if unity is desired)
- Creates possible issues with overall bulk and scale
Encourage street facing balconies, porches

Many buildings in Eastsound have this feature in one form or another. They provide overhead weather protection and, when done well, are an inviting and welcoming architectural element. These features are not required by the zoning code. “Encouraging” these features could be in the form of some kind of bonus in the zoning code, or a change in the code to require them in certain locations.

Why do it?

- Provides overhead weather protection for commercial venues and adds a welcoming esthetic
- If required, would over time become a distinctive, character giving element for the Village
- When provided for street level residential uses, provides residents with a strong connection to the neighborhood and a more ‘neighborly’ feel

Why not do it?

- On small lots could be difficult to accommodate
- If constructed too high from the street the connection to the neighborhood is lost, therefore the benefit
Reconsider 35’ height limit north of Rose Street

Current zoning restricts building height to 35ft from average grade to top of gable. With reasonable floor to ceiling heights and an accommodation of minimum 6:12 roof pitch it can be a challenge to fit three full floors within the allowable envelope. Should the height limit be raised slightly, say to 40ft, three floors would be easier to accommodate. Alternatively, if the requirement for a 6:12 minimum pitched gable be eliminated the height limit could remain the same and have the same effect. Raising the allowable height from 35ft to 45ft or 50ft would allow four floors of construction.

Why do it?

- Raising the allowable height would allow for greater density, which in turn could encourage the construction of affordable housing units within the Village (see section on Village housing)

Why not do it?

- Increased allowable area alone does not guarantee that affordable housing will be constructed
- Raising the building height may change and adversely impact the small-scale residential character of Eastsound.
Create a “village core” zone, and/or Make the Prune Alley to North Beach Road corridor a special design zone

The Village center is divided into three zones: Village Commercial and Village Commercial Limited, surrounded by Village Residential (see map below). Is this refined enough for the future, or should an additional zone be inserted within Village Commercial zone designating the ‘core’ of the commercial zone? If developed, this zone could have different zoning limitations and require certain uses that are not required in other zones within the Village.

Why do it?

- Establishes a stronger hierarchy within the Village
- Helps identify the center, or ‘heart’ of the Village
- Could allow greater density (see height limit precept above)
- Could help retail experience if coinciding with the retail core of the Village and requiring specific elements conducive to quality retail

Why not do it?

- May suggest a hierarchy of desirability within the Village that is less egalitarian
- More density may not be desired
Reward/encourage development of a few architectural icons

Significant works of art and/or architecture can have a huge impact on the identity of a town, helping to create uniqueness and provide visual markers to ease way-finding. Romans used obelisks ‘liberated’ from Egypt as well as other works of architecture and statuary to mark major intersections and boulevards, as did Napoleon. Traditional American town planning featured a town square with significant public buildings (town hall, library) fronting the square. If Eastsound were to consider locations for strong visual elements, possible locations would include a visual terminus for the north end of North Beach Road, and the west end of A Street. Should the Fern Street ROW be developed as a street or public way, the current public restrooms building will become a terminus point that would be unfortunate in its current form.
Why do it?

- Helps create uniqueness and identity for the Village
- Helps visitors orient themselves

Why not do it?

- Installation of significant architectural elements or works of art that are simply not good would do more harm than good to the fabric of the Village
- Identifying the wrong locations, or the wrong things for the right locations, do not offer advantages for the Village
Eastsound ‘Seaside Village Esthetic’

Some specific observations regarding character

The overall character – the look and feel of Eastsound– is reflective of its particular history. How it looks and feels in the future will be a reflection of our priorities as a community. Our buildings and gardens demonstrate our talents as designers, craftspeople and gardeners. Our public ways, parks and civic buildings reflect our commitment to the environment, civic culture and the arts. Eastsounds’ character and charm is imprinted in our minds by the strongest elements of the Village. How can we encourage future development to build upon the strongest elements in order to enhance and improve our built environment? How can we address areas in need of support and change?

We understand that a primary economic driver of the Village is tourism. The level of character and charm of the Village is related to the economic success of the Village. How can charm and character be enhanced and improved for both residents and tourists?

1. In looking at these questions in this section we have broken down our observations of the Village into three distinct areas:

*Buildings* – their character, placement and spaces in between them

*Storefronts* – their proximity, character and identity

*Streetscapes* – wayfinding, accessibility, character and safety

**BUILDINGS**

*Community input:*

- Lush, cheery plantings
- Muted building hues
- Small scale
- Mixed uses
- Continuity of architecture/color palette
- Look at examples of similar towns
- Don’t lose sight of what we have now
- 6:12 to 12:12 pitch and related standards are right, particularly for Main St.
- Natural wood and glass
• Don’t ‘theme’ our village
• Uniformity of architecture is boring

Use zones

The zoning code does not make a distinction within the village commercial zone with respect to where allowed uses should go. Nevertheless, what has developed over time is a fairly distinct retail zone focused around main and north beach road and a distinct residential zone north of Rose and east of Prune Alley. Zones to the NW around the post office and SE at Island Market represent less distinct local services zones. This town pattern, developed organically over time, is clear and understandable, with commercial functions at its core. Future development will provide an opportunity to improve and build upon this established pattern.

An important question with respect to the development of these zones is whether the existing, undifferentiated zoning restrictions are sufficient to promote the most appropriate and desirable development in each particular zone. Should the buildings at Main and North Beach have the same exact envelope requirements as a residential lot on Pine Street and School Road? If these were to be differentiated in some ways, what would be most appropriate? One possibility would be allowing a bit more density in the commercial core, with existing zoning remaining as-is in other areas. For example, if the height limit in the commercial core were raised 5ft, it would allow two stories of residential over a commercial base. This might encourage future developments to include residential in their program mix, which would in turn help enliven the commercial experience and provide ‘eyes on the street’ from a safety standpoint.

Village edge and termination points

One of the defining characteristics of Eastsound is its distinct boundaries, with shoreline to the south, protected lands to the east and west and Pioneer Hill to the north. These boundaries are a vital part of what makes the Village unique – as well as uniquely connected to the environment. Projects such as the waterfront park, the bio-swale and the trail from the airport have helped to establish a connection between the Village and its surrounding natural areas. Recognizing the incredible asset these natural areas are to the character and livability of the Village, it would be prudent to plan carefully for their preservation. The wetland area in particular, given its critical function to the ecosystem, will require diligence to preserve it intact from encroaching development.
From a town-planning standpoint, as the Village grows, the edges will become more distinct, much like traditional European village.

Where streets end at open space, there are opportunities to establish trailheads and other amenities that further strengthen the connection to surrounding open space such as trail heads that access the loop between Crescent Beach, Mt. Baker Rd., though the village and back.

Clarifying Village boundaries is an important aspect of town planning, as it allows visitors to gain an intuitive sense for town scale – as well as encourage exploration. Where streets now tend to ‘fade away’, there is the potential to plan for elements that act as visual cues to visitors for where the edges are.

An example is North Beach Road. Looking to the south it is very clear and distinct that the commercial district terminates here. On the other hand, looking north it lacks a distinctive edge. For commercial businesses to thrive moving northward along the street it would be helpful to have a visual element that both draws one northward and provides a definitive end to the commercial area. Over time, the street fills-in with commercial uses from one end to the other, and the notion that one end is more desirable than the other is reduced.
Another example is A Street. The west end lacks any particular visual queue to encourage one to venture westward from North Beach Road, and what retail exists is hamstrung by a lack of visual interest that would function as a draw for pedestrians. Should it be clear to pedestrians that there is somewhere further to explore down this street, it would become more active.

A third observation is Fern Street. Should Fern Street be extended to North Beach Road, it will create a formal, axial relationship with a utilitarian restroom building at its west end, which isn’t a great relationship. Given there is pressure for expansion of these facilities, the potential exists to re-envision this critical function – possibly through combining with another public function, to create a more appropriate, iconic element that marks the geographic center of the village.
Building form and character

What makes an individual building successful esthetically is subjective, however there are buildings within Eastsound that a plurality of community members would rate as ‘good’ and others that would be understood as ‘bad’. The ‘good’ buildings feature an appealing form and scale that helps to define our seaside village character and demonstrate a careful attention to detail. Their colors harmonize with their surroundings and they are not trying too hard to stand out.

Currently there are two primary tools in place to encourage good building development. Zoning restrictions are the most powerful tool, and some of the existing ‘bad’ buildings would not meet current zoning code requirements with respect to rooflines and break-up of scale. Community design review is the other tool. While lacking the ‘teeth’ of zoning restrictions, the process can nevertheless encourage good development and discourage the bad. Looking at ways to improve and strengthen these tools will help ensure future development meets the expectations of the community.
In discussing these tools, it is important to identify some key building blocks of good design:

- form and scale
- setbacks/space between buildings
- color and material
- porches, trellises and other building features
- property edges (fences, hedges, etc.)

Building form and scale are currently governed by the zoning code, while other elements are at the discretion of the owner/designer, with no particular requirements or guidelines to build from other than feedback from design review. Some areas of potential improvement:

**Zoning:**

- differentiate individual zones within Eastsound with respect to building height and density
- consider refinement of building form requirements with respect to roof pitch, gable orientation, maximum façade width
- consider providing design review with an official role within the permitting process

**Design review:**

- consider the desired make-up of this committee for best possible results
- consider further definition of its role within the building permit approval process
- consider allowing review committee to recommend approval for minor departures from zoning for better design
• consider development of a Design Guide for Village development for reference by landowners and committee members in the design review process. Look to similar communities with a strong character for good examples for reference

**Spaces between buildings**

The best examples of open spaces in Eastsound tend to have one particular element in common: the lack of a parking lot. Many of these properties were developed prior to current parking requirements, so could not be emulated today... This is a serious concern to the future character and vitality of the Village. It is worth carefully considering whether current parking requirements are truly necessary at their current levels, and worth considering alternatives to requiring parking within an individual property. Alternatives, including a public parking lot that would count toward individual property parking requirements, may be a more appropriate solution to the parking issue, allowing the commercial core to retain its pedestrian focus. For more on parking, please refer to the parking section of this report.

**STOREFRONTS**

*Community input:*

- Upkeep of shop-fronts
- Long-term viability of retail business
- Tourism is key to economy
- Develop romantic scale with wind protected spaces
- Allow temporary retail sheds

A healthy retail community contributes greatly to vitality and richness within the village. The village is only economically viable, beyond providing essential services to the community, if it is a highly desirable destination for both residents and visitors. A critical ingredient to a great village destination experience includes inviting, visually appealing retail establishments that are concentrated in an identifiable commercial neighborhood. The previous section on town pattern suggests a definition of this general retail/commercial zone, and within this zone it would be advantageous for future development to carefully consider what makes for a
successful retail experience. Some characteristics of a successful retail neighborhood are outlined below, along with comments on how these characteristics can be encouraged.

**Critical mass** – retail collected in dense area rather than spread out among other less interesting/nonpublic use properties. This might suggest the need for street level retail requirements within the retail zone in order to ensure there are few ‘missing teeth’ in the retail experience.

**Pedestrian scale storefronts** – enhances psychological comfort and adds visual appeal to the Village experience. Window break-up, height and placement – as well as porches and trellis elements, are all important components. Consideration of good storefront design would be an important component of any new Development Guidelines.

**Appropriate scale of retail spaces** – this includes both the floor area of retail spaces as well as an appropriate ceiling height/volume of space. For example, the Seattle zoning code requires a minimum height of 12’-6” for street-front retail. This is in recognition of the tendency to lower retail ceiling height in order to gain more floors of space above, at the expense of quality retail on the street. Low ceiling heights are typically not conducive to a good retail experience.

**Transparency** – a great view from the street to the goods and services being offered within an establishment is the most compelling strategy for drawing people into a space – and also serves to activate the street experience. Many successful retail streets, such as Ballard Avenue in Seattle, have strict guidelines with respect to maintaining transparency within a storefront.

**Permeability** – the ability to open-up a space to outside in mild weather is a key component to financial success in summer months, when most of us are dis-inclined to be indoors if we can help it.

**Quality materials** – materials such as painted wood and steel, well detailed and of pleasing proportions, are far more appealing than the ubiquitous aluminum storefront common to shopping malls. Some successful retail districts have actually banned them.

**Quality identity graphics & signage** – Signage can enhance or ruin a retail storefront visually. Signage type, scale, color and materials are all key components to good identity signage design. Many, if not most, highly successful retail streets have strict guidelines regarding signage.
STREET-SCAPE

Community input:

- safety/security
- incomplete sidewalks
- poor pedestrian safety on some streets
- become less car friendly, more pedestrian focused
- walking mall (perhaps off Prune Alley)
- parking and pedestrian walkways outside commercial core zone
Public spaces, including streets and utilities, are owned and managed by the community. As such, how they are developed and maintained is a reflection of the priorities and values of the community. What do our streets, open spaces and utility infrastructure say about our priorities as a community? Do they accurately reflect our values and understanding of our environment?

**Sidewalks**

The current project to provide sidewalks along the southern half of Prune Alley represents a significant improvement to accessibility and pedestrian mobility in the Village. Sidewalks increase safety, accessibility and mobility for pedestrians and as such should be strongly encouraged and planned for - throughout the commercial zone of the Village as a first priority and extending beyond over time. Existing sidewalks have a distinctive pressed concrete pattern mimicking wood planks, which is a unique feature of the town that is worth continuing and building upon in the future. Paving materials, edges and curbs can be taken for granted as purely utilitarian requirements, or considered design opportunities that further express the unique character of Eastsound.
Landscape & street furniture elements

Street furniture, such as trash / recycle receptacles, bike racks and benches are all utilitarian requirements that also represent opportunities to make the Village a more unique and interesting place. They present opportunities for local artists and craftspeople to contribute to village character and charm. Landscaped areas within the public right of way offer similar opportunities.

Way Finding
Way finding elements directing visitors to major town destinations such as parks, the library, visitor parking, etc. presents a similar opportunity to enhance uniqueness and character. These elements will become more important as the Village grows over time.

Storm-water management
Storm-water filtration in Eastsound is assumed to be effective in the areas managed by the bio-swale, and lacks any filtration whatsoever in others areas - where runoff is piped directly to the beach. Given our understanding of the pollutants present in street runoff as well as its effects on fish and other wildlife, this lack of treatment should be unacceptable to the community. Further, piping runoff to the beach deprives the watershed of necessary recharge. The current Prune Alley improvements includes a filtration plan, however it is far from completely filtering runoff and will likely prove to be ineffective during times of intense rain, given its limited capacity. Further, it continues to pipe runoff to the beach, thus doing nothing to re-charge the water-shed. It is worth looking into how this minimal effort came to pass, as there are likely lessons to be learned. Moving forward, more robust storm-water filtration should be expected of the County. This infrastructure has a visual component that can be an esthetic enhancement to the Village. One example of effective private property storm management is the bio-swale at Island Market, which provides a visual buffer to the parking lot as well as an attractive edge to the sidewalk. This type of approach is becoming more and more common on public streets as well.
Lighting

Good quality lighting, both within the public realm as well as on private property, is an important component to a quality environment after dark. The current code requires night-sky friendly fixtures be used for all outdoor fixtures on private property. This is not something a building inspector is able to evaluate during routine site visits however, as they occur during the day. Further, the permitting process does not require the submittal of actual fixture specifications. Given the above, this code is essentially enforced only through complaints after the fact. It is worth considering a requirement that fixture submittals be included with permit applications. It would be important to consider not only appropriate ‘cut-off angles’ that ensure a night-sky friendly application, but also total wattage and color rendering (people usually prefer a warm, incandescent glow, which translates to 2,700 to 3,000 degrees kelvin).

Examples of Good Lighting
Examples of Bad Lighting

In the public realm, lighting is typically considered in a totally utilitarian manner - most commonly solved with an unsightly fixture mounted high on a power pole. The notion of bringing light down low, and concentrating it in pedestrian areas rather than streets, would make more sense – and be more appealing – however this tends to be more expensive and therefore less common. Good quality lighting has a huge impact on the after dark experience - adding visual appeal and enhancing the perception of security and safety. Over time, quality lighting within the commercial zone can help extend viable hours of business operation. It also presents another opportunity to engage with local artisans to create lighting elements that further individualize the experience of Eastsound.
**Retail/Housing**

The village core is the primary retail center for Orcas Island and should absorb most of the retail growth on the island. Also the core should provide a significant amount of housing to maintain the concept of residential growth being focused in the urban growth area of the Comprehensive Plan and to ensure the viability of the village as a walking neighborhood. As indicated in the Report introduction the Urban Growth Area is to absorb about 800 new housing units by 2035. As noted in the review of Eastsound village core, housing units in and near the village core are in high demand and short supply. Many stakeholders want to encourage “home over shop” development. Further many retailers and other businesses need affordable housing for staff near their enterprise.

This map shows the Village core (1/4 mile radius) with Village Commercial zone in red and the two density study areas outlined in black.
As this map shows the Village Commercial zone is completely contained in the village core. It is the highest housing density zoning on the island (40 units per acre) and includes land parcels totaling nearly 42.7 acres. If fully built-out this theoretically could accommodate over 1700 housing units. However 6.3 acres of it are committed to public, semi-public or essentially fixed uses such as the Island Market. Another 13.7 acres is affected by a wetland designation, leaving 22.7 acres available for future development. This could accommodate a maximum of just over 900 housing units if all of it was redeveloped to full capacity in the 20 year planning time frame...an unlikely happenstance (and a conflict with retail). However as the following retail/housing density analysis will show, if the ground or first floor of the properties facing on the main retail streets of Main, North Beach and Prune Aly are reserved for retail, the maximum housing achievable is in the range of 39-50% of Allowable. This affects 17.6 of the 22.7 acres. Accepting this then makes the theoretical capacity at full build out;

17.6 acres x 40 units/acre allowed x 50% achievable = 352 units (retail + housing area) + 
22.7-17.6 x 40 units/acre x 100% achievable = 204 units (housing only area) 
For a total actual (but still theoretical) capacity of 556 housing units if everything is built out in the 20 year planning time frame, which as noted above is an unlikely happenstance. More single family residences, an allowed use in this zone (and currently not subject to architectural standards), would further reduce the housing capacity of the village core. So what would be a more realistic expectation of capacity in this time frame? Maybe half of the theoretical 556?

Precepts and analysis are as follows:

- Retail / Housing Density Analysis (scenarios A,B,C,D,E,F)
- Housing Only Density Analysis (scenarios a),b),c),d))
- An Inn on Victory Hill
- Inn & Institute on Victory Hill
- A Mini Home Park for design worthy Residence
The analysis discussed above is derived from the following two sets of studies.

**Retail/Housing Density Analysis (scenarios A, B, C, D, E, F)**

We have chosen the central village area from North Beach Road to Prune Alley, and from Main Street to A Street to analyze as combination retail and housing because it is the heart of the village and the tax parcels in it provide a variety of situations.

Development density in the village is regulated by front and side yard requirements, a lot coverage and a height limit which determine the bulk allowed on a site, and by a parking requirement, based on use, which also limits the allowable building area. What actually gets developed will be influenced by demand, cost, and achievable rental return as well as by the regulations. For the sake of this analysis which seeks to show the range of possible outcomes, we set aside the economic issues and deal only with what might be possible under existing regulation. We assume a developer’s objective of maximum ground floor retail, and maximum second floor housing. We examine 3 scenarios for development:

A. Development driven by parking on site and above grade
B. Development driven by maximum density (accepting underground parking)
C. Development driven by maximum density with a combination of on site, on grade and offsite parking strategies.

We assume on street parking that at some time may have been ceded to an adjacent parcel for a property concession is adequate to cover the minor parking shortfalls of Scheme A (average 1.4 spaces per parcel). Otherwise we ignore them (too complicated and too insignificant to figure them out in thus study) except in the case of the Coop site where the parking count /land trade-off is large and more obvious. There we count them in all Scenarios. Thus the parking provided numbers for some parcels may be slightly understated.

The table below compares the three scenarios and the existing condition by retail/office space provided, number of housing units more than and less than 550 square feet, required parking and parking provided by the scenario. The reason for splitting the housing into the two size categories is that the regulations require one parking space for units less than 550 square feet, but one and a half parking spaces for units over 550 square feet.
These scenarios yield between 28,000 and 47,000 gross square feet of retail and 12 to 42 units of housing. Maximum allowable unit density for these properties in this zone is approximately 81. Even with a setback 3rd floor added to part of Scenario B only about 60% of the maximum is achieved. Though a few of the larger of these units could be subdivided to add units this clearly indicates that if first or ground floor is preserved for retail the maximum is not achievable.

An issue clearly raised by this analysis is whether or not the parking requirements, lot coverage and height restrictions currently in place serve future objectives well.

**Retail/ Housing Density Analysis of Eastsound Village Core (North Beach/A/ Prune Alley/ Main)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Scenario</th>
<th>Retail/Office GSF</th>
<th>Res &gt;550</th>
<th>Res &lt;550</th>
<th>req,d parkg*</th>
<th>Parkg provided*</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Existing situation</td>
<td>25,587</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>A. Parking on site above grade</strong></td>
<td>28,828</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>103</td>
<td>92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>B. Max Density, underground parking</strong></td>
<td>47,630</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>C. Max w/ on + off-site parking</strong></td>
<td>31,957</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>143</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above chart shows the three scenarios producing markedly different results.

These GSF numbers are compiled from the scenarios and are shown on each scenario plan. Parking required is based on an assumption of 80% net to gross ratio for retail space. This does not count ceded on-street spaces except for the Coop site (parcel 207000 on plans).
**Scenario A** driven by onsite surface parking allows a modest 13% increase in retail space and adds 18 new housing units.

Advantages of **A**:
- Smallest scale feel
- Lowest development cost
- Places some of on grade parking in center of block away from street
- Small housing units may support walk to work

Disadvantages of **A**:
- A lot of on grade parking and driveways disrupting sidewalks
- Least accommodation of retail and housing in village core
- Low density may not support cost of redevelopment (provides 15% of allowable housing)
- Requires partnering between parcels where parking is mid-block

**Scenario B** driven to maximum density by parking underground allows an 86% increase in retail space and 42 additional housing units. It provides a surplus of 11 parking spaces which could be used in support of additional housing if a third floor were allowed.

Advantages of **B**:
- Adds a substantial housing base, helping make village viable (provides 52% of allowable housing)
- High end housing adds visitor/part timer base
- Smaller housing units may support walk to workers
- Adds a lot of retail and/or live/work space
- Removes cars from the pedestrian environment, placing them underground
- Accommodates a lot of future growth

Disadvantages of **B**:
- All traffic generated by parking comes to core (over 100 more cars than C)
- Most costly development approach
- Is a marked increase in Village scale
- Requires partnering between smaller parcels to accommodate garages
• Requires lot line to lot line underground development for parking (regulations are silent on this)

**Scenario C** driven to maximize density, but avoiding underground parking by a combination of on site and off site surface parking, allows a 25% increase in retail space and 42 additional housing units (the same as Scenario B). However, it requires the development of 79 off-site parking spaces within a close walking distance of the village core.

**Advantages of C:**

• Achieves high density at a lower development cost than B
• Provides the same housing count as B

**Disadvantages of C:**

• A lot of on Grade parking on Prune Aly making it largely a car place
• Requires development of off-site shared parking lots for 79 cars
• Provides less retail than B
• Is a marked increase in Village scale
• Requires partnering between parcels where parking is mid-block

**Summary**

It is possible to modestly increase retail and housing on these village core parcels under existing regulations with on-site parking but at the cost of a great deal of ground area consumed by parking.

It is possible to greatly increase both retail and housing density by constructing underground parking, but one could argue that the traffic generated by access to those garages is one of the prices of that density.

It is possible to achieve significant density of both housing and retail with partial off-site parking, but even that creates a lot of driveways.

Following are plans and axonometric drawings of each scenario. Each scenario is depicted in three sets of parcels working from south to north (Main Street to A Street). The spelling of Prune Alley as “Prune Aly” was taken from the County’s Polaris web site (our bad).
Scenario A: On site Surface Parking Driven  Parcels 201000 & 205000

0.784 acres, 9,678 gsf retail, 7 housing units (23% of maximum), 38 parking spaces

Ground Floor (retail)  Second Floor (residential)

Roof Plan  Axonometric View
Scenario A (continued) Parcels 207000, 209000 & 210000

0.644 acres, 12,258 gsf retail, 4 housing units (10% of maximum), 28 parking spaces

Ground Floor (retail)

Second Floor (residential/commercial)

Roof Plan

Axonometric View
Scenario A (continued) Parcels 212000, 213000, 214000 & 215000

0.620 acres, 6892 gsf retail, 6 housing units (29% of max), 26 parking spaces

Ground Floor (retail)  Second Floor (residential)

Roof Plan  Axonometric View
Scenario B: Maximum Density, Underground Parking

Parcels 201000 & 205000  0.784 acres, 19,270 gsf retail, 12 housing units (39% of maximum), 93 parking spaces
ScENARIO B (CONTINUED)

Parcels 201000 & 205000

The setback 3\textsuperscript{rd} floor added to the building mass shown on the right could easily add another 6 housing units to this scenario, raising it from 39% to 57% of the maximum allowed. The additional parking required (9 spaces) is already accommodated in the garage.
Scenario B (continued) Parcels 207000, 209000 & 210000

0.644 acres, 14,110 gsf retail, 14 housing units (54% of maximum), 60 parking spaces

Underground Parking Level

Ground Floor (retail)

Second Floor (residential)

Roof Plan
Scenario B (continued) Parcels 207000, 209000 & 210000
Scenario B (continued) Parcels 212000, 213000, 214000 & 215000

0.620 acres, 14,250 gsf retail, 16 housing units (65% of maximum), 53 parking spaces

Underground Parking Level

Ground Floor (retail)

Second Floor (residential)

Roof Plan
Scenario B (continued) Parcels 212000, 213000, 214000 & 215000

Axonometric View
Scenario C: Maximum Density on & off site surface parking

Parcels 201000 & 205000  0.784 acres, 12,847 gsf retail, 12 housing units (39% of maximum), 24 parking spaces

First Floor (retail)  
Second Floor (residential)  
Roof Plan  
Axonometric View
Scenario C: Maximum Density on & off site surface parking

(continued) Parcels 207000, 209000 & 210000 0.644 acres, 10,790 gsf retail, 14 housing units (54% max), 24 parking spaces
Scenario C: Maximum Density on & off site surface parking
(continued)  Parcels 212000, 213000, 214000 & 215000

0.620 acres, 8,320 gsf retail, 16 housing units (65% of maximum), 16 parking spaces
Alternative Scenario D for Parcels 201000 & 205000

0.784 acres, 12,090 gsf retail, 8 housing units (26% of maximum) 28 parking spaces versus 45 required

This test alternative provides more retail space and and 1 more housing unit than Scenario A and it recognizes a need for phased development of the site. It also creates a village scale courtyard reflecting the existing one across North Beach.

First floor (retail)  Second Floor (housing)  
Roof Plan  Axonometric View
Alternative Scenario E for Parcels 201000 & 205000

0.784 acres, 19,220 gsf retail, 12 housing units (39% of maximum) 87 parking spaces versus 70 required

This test alternative provides about the same retail space and housing units as Scenario B, but it provides a more open and smaller scale feel. It also accommodates phased development better.
Alternative Scenarios F for lots around Fern Street ROW

These alternatives are shown primarily to demonstrate how a developer could respond to Fern Street as a public walking access. They produce two more housing units and a lot less retail space than scenario A, and less of both than Scenarios B and C.

Parcels 212000 (north) and 210000 (south)

Potential development (same proposal for lots north and south of Fern Street)
- 3-Units of ground floor retail
- 3-Unit upper level residential**
- 2-3 story wood frame building(s)
- On-grade parking (on-site, street and remote)

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area: 271455212 0.16 acre
Density: 0.16 acre x 40 DUA = 6.4 (6 allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>3 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>1400</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&gt;550 sf)</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>960</td>
<td>1.5/Unit</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>480</td>
<td>1/300 sf</td>
<td>3.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1/300 sf</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

11.0*

* (4) Stalls on-site, (4) on street and (3) off-site (remote).

** Upper level space could be retail, office, hospitality, etc.

Pros and cons of these alternatives

PRO
- Increase residential and/or live/work units in town
- 35% of required parking is on-site behind/under buildings

CON
- Decreased commercial space
- 15% of required parking is on-street and 50% is off-site
- Requires modification of zoning and/or architectural regulations to accommodate:
  - 3rd Story
  - Remote or decreased parking
  - Proposed building set-back encroachment (facing Fern Street ROW)
- Relies on there being public access from the Fern Street ROW
Parcel 209000

Potential development
- 2-Units of ground floor retail
- 3-Units upper level residential**
- 2-story wood frame building
- On-grade parking (on-site, street and remote)

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area: 0.16acre
Density: 0.16 acre x 40 DUA = 6.4 (6 allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&gt;550 sf)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>1 Bed / 1 Bath</td>
<td>760</td>
<td>1.0/Unit</td>
<td>1.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>600</td>
<td>1/300 sf</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Retail</td>
<td>1000</td>
<td>1/300 sf</td>
<td>3.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

9.8 (10.0)*

* (4) Stalls on-site, (3) on street and (3) off-site (remote).
** Upper level space could be retail, office, hospitality, etc.

Pros and cons to building mixed-use in village core

PRO
- Increase residential and/or live/work units in town
- 45% of required parking is on-site behind buildings

CON
- Decreased commercial space
- 30% of required parking is on-street and 25% is off-site
- Requires modification of zoning regulations to accommodate remote or decreased parking
Figure 4.16
Level 1
Figure 4.17
Level 2
Figure 4.18
View from Prune Aly looking Northwest
Figure 4.19
View from North Beach Road looking Southeast
Figure 4.20
View from Prune Aly looking Northwest

Figure 4.21
View from North Beach looking Southeast
Housing Only Density Analysis

We have chosen the village core area on the West side of Pine Street from Rose Street to School Road to analyze as “housing only” because of its prime location for housing, central, but off the more commercial streets. These schemes use various approaches to dealing with parking accommodation and height limit to test the ability to achieve density. Collectively they achieve 50 housing Units where density regulation would allow 41.

Four scenarios are examined on different parts of the block:

a) Exceed allowed Density on double Corner Lot  
b) Density Conforming on Double Mid-Block Lot  
c) Density Conforming single Mid-Block Lot  
d) Density Conforming Single Corner Lot with large units  

These studies show that it is possible to meet parking, lot coverage and architectural standards and achieve maximum allowable density if development is residential only. On the a) site it also shows that if a third story is allowed and underground parking utilized a density 74% greater than allowed can be achieved. Each of the scenarios is preceded by analysis.

a) Exceed allowed Density on double Corner Lot

Parcels 271453101 and 271453102 (single ownership)

Potential development (assumes development of two adjoining parcels)

- 24-Unit multi-family
- 2-Story wood frame construction on 1-story concrete garage (3-story building)
- On-site underground parking

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area:  
271453101  0.26 acre  
271453102  0.09 acre  
Total  0.35 acre
Density:  
0.35 acre x 40 DUA = 14 (allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.0/Unit (&lt;550 sf)</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&gt;550 sf)</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>3 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>1250</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>24*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>29*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
* Decreasing unit count to code allowed (14) may remove need for underground parking.

**Pros and cons to increasing residential density**

**PRO**
- Increase market rate and/or ADA accessible rental units in town
- Required parking 100% on-site
- Additional on-street parking

**CON**
- Cost of underground parking structure
- Larger scale building(s)
- Requires modification to zoning and/or architectural design requirements to accommodate increased density and third story
Figure 4.1
Level 1

Figure 4.2
Level 2
Figure 4.3
Level 3

Figure 4.4
Intersection of Pine Street and School Road looking Southeast
Figure 4.5
Intersection of Pine Street and School Road looking Southeast

Figure 4.6
Pine Street looking Northwest
a) Conform to allowable Density on Double Mid-Block Lot
Parcels 271453103 and 271453104 (single ownership)

Potential development (assumes development of two adjoining parcels)
- 13-Unit multi-family
- (4) 2-story wood frame buildings
- On-grade parking (on-site and street)

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Parcel</th>
<th>Area (acre)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>271453103</td>
<td>0.17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>271453104</td>
<td>0.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>0.35</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Density: 0.35 acre x 40 DUA = 14 (allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1/Unit (&lt;550 sf)</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&lt;550 sf)</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>17.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros and cons to building to allowed density

PRO
- Increase residential units in town
- Built to current zoning and architectural regulations
- 2-Story units could be live/work (would increase required parking)
- 70% or required parking is on-site behind buildings

CON
- More buildings
- Less open space
- 30% of required parking is on-street
Figure 4.7
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Figure 4.8
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Figure 4.9
Pine Street looking Northwest
b) Density Conforming single Mid-Block Lot
Parcel 271453105

Potential development
- 6-Unit multi-family
- (3) 2-story wood frame buildings
- On-grade parking (on-site and street)

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area: 0.17 acre
Density: 0.17 acre x 40 DUA = 6.8 (6 allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Studio</td>
<td>500</td>
<td>1.0/Unit (&lt;550 sf)</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2 Bed / 2 Bath</td>
<td>900</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&gt;550 sf)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros and cons to building to allowed density

PRO
- Increase residential units in town
- Built to current zoning and architectural regulations
- 2-Story units could be live/work (would increase required parking)
- 85% or required parking is on-site behind buildings

CON
- More buildings
- Less open space
- 15% of required parking is on-street
c) Density Conforming Single Corner Lot with large units
Parcel 271453106

Potential development
- 6-Unit multi-family with on-grade parking under buildings
- 3-Story wood frame building(s)
- On-grade parking (on-site and street)

Parcel information
Zoning: VC - Village Commercial, (40) dwelling units per acre (DUA)
Lot area: 0.17 acre
Density: 0.17 acre x 40 DUA = 6.8 (6 allowed)

Possible Unit mix

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>No.</th>
<th>Configuration</th>
<th>Area (sf)</th>
<th>Parking factor</th>
<th>Req. Parking</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>1 Bed / 1 Bath</td>
<td>750</td>
<td>1.5/Unit (&gt;550 sf)</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>2 Bed / 1 Bath</td>
<td>1100</td>
<td>1.5/Unit</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Pros and cons to providing on-grade under-building parking

PRO
- 3rd Story allows more open space
- Parking under building allows more open space
- 65% of required parking is on-site under buildings

CON
- 3-Story structure
- Require modifications to zoning and/or architectural design standards
- 35% of required parking is on-street
Figure 4.10
Level 1

Figure 4.11
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Figure 4.12
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Figure 4.13
Pine Street looking West
(lot 271453105 only)
Figure 4.14
Potential residential development of lots 271453100-5 on Pine Street viewed from Intersection of Pine Street and School Road.

Figure 4.15
Pine Street looking Northwest.
Interesting terminus for North Beach

**An Inn on Victory Hill**

Encourage architecturally interesting Building on Victory Hill.

**Why Do it?**

- Provides a pedestrian draw to the upper end of North Beach
- As a visitor destination, Eastsound could use another high quality inn
- Outlook in all directions could be a real draw
- Potential for public outlook in front of Inn adds to pedestrian Draw

**Why not Do it?**

- Requires willing property owner with a business model to make it work
- The site is ideal for a number of uses including semi-public institutional uses (school for the arts) and for high density residential uses
Complementary Inn & Arts Institute

Inn & Institute on Victory Hill

Develop an Inn with a Music, Visual and Dramatic Arts Center

Why Do it?

- Adds a Tourist destination Inn
- Combine with visiting artist accommodations and studio space
- Make institute for teaching by visiting Festival Artists
- Existing red house makes great support facility (restaurant, conference center)
- Could be a major boost to festival town

Why not Do it?

- Requires willing property owner with a business model to make it work
- Requires Institutional Support System
Opportunity for Unique Affordable Housing

A Mini Home Park for well-designed Residences

Encourage architecturally affordable housing (<400sf)

258 sf home by Czech firm Miramari Design

<300 sf home by English firm Thomas Alabaster (reported cost about $20,000)

Why Do it?

• Provides a unique opportunity for small affordable Housing
• If done with a quality design focus can be an interesting attraction in itself
• Can achieve the highest density of single family freestanding homes

Why not Do it?

• Requires willing property owner with appropriate property and a business model to make it work
• Market for ultra mini homes not demonstrated on Orcas Island
• **Infrastructure/greenspace**

Since Eastsound is virtually surrounded by wetlands draining through the village to the Fishing Bay outflow and the current filtration system covers only a portion of the flow, there is a major opportunity to both enhance the village character and improve the water quality in the bay by artful, well-engineered constructed wetland filter systems.

Crescent Beach offers one of very few public access points to saltwater beachfront. That combined with the opportunity to hike the preserve trail makes the potential for a unique park experience by elimination of the roadway between preserve and beachfront a very intriguing opportunity.

The following precepts are offered:

- Identify areas for new constructed wetlands
- New Constructed wetlands/parking/development partnerships
- Restored Beach/ Public Park
Wetland Paths and parking areas

Identify areas for new constructed wetlands

Why Do it?

- Study existing watersheds and treatment strategies and develop areas for possible new treatment
- Develop a raingarden street standard that allows localized treatment along parking areas (along new expanded 50’ right of ways?)
- Create or extend the existing constructed wetlands that would help remove the burden from filtered areas
- Develop new “wetland boardwalk” paths through the core connecting parking and wetlands

Why not Do it?

- Cost
- Wetland Mitigation/interference
Paths and parking areas

New constructed wetlands / parking / development partnerships

Why Do it?

- On the long-term horizon where wetland treatment of polluted runoff may become more and more critical to the health of Eastsound and its ecosystem – can we develop more constructed wetlands?
- Village could be linked by constructed wetlands, paths, and rain gardens
- Can additional studies be done to determine the capacity of the existing wetland for help reduce pollution runoff? How much is the Eastsound swale or Crescent beach currently helping? Could they help more?

Why not Do it?

- Cost
- Wetland Mitigation/interference
- Major change in village
Crescent Beach

Restored Beach/ Public Park

Road dead ended at turnarounds with parking at East and West ends. Beach and wetland reconnected. Some camping allowed. Bike and hike trail through preserve extended to west parking area. This might well need to be combined with a new East-west road through the preserve to accommodate traffic volume (see precepts in Traffic/Parking section).

Why Do it?

- Restores natural connection of wetlands and Ship Bay
- Opens beach to camping walking
- Creates another important Orcas visitor destination
- Extends bike/hike trail through preserve making it more of a loop to/from Eastsound
- Rising sea levels, winter storms (such as on 3.11.16 shown above) make roadway less viable

Why not Do it?

- Greatly increases traffic pressure on Mount Baker Road
- Increases distances from western part of island to eastern part by 1.2 miles (though this is directed route anyway)
- Requires approval of Preserve and County
- Adversely affects some businesses
- Is inconvenient for properties off east end of Crescent Beach
- Traffic volume may require a road connection through the land preserve (see traffic precepts)
Public Space/ Water Orientation

Public spaces are key to the soul of a village. They provide the sense of community through hosting celebrations, parades, gatherings, festivals and serendipitous meeting and greeting. Eastsound as its very name insists is a waterside community and has the Sound as its front yard. How the village develops and responds to these two sets of assets goes a long way to determining its character.

This is a list of the precepts to follow:

- Amphitheatre Tiers
- Mini Playground
- Year Round Roofed Sheds
- Pea Patch Gardens (alt.1)
- Pea Patch Gardens (alt. 2)
- Park/Passage
- Town (or April) Square
- Transit & Non-motorized Vehicle Center
- Grand Stair & Ramp
- Public Outlook
- Outflow Stair to Beach
- Waterfront View Corridors
- 20 New Buoys
- Expanded Capacity
- Waterfront Dinghy Dock
- Historic Templin’s pier Replicated
- Pier to Indian Island
- Grand Canal
Village Green with

Amphitheatre Tiers

Five essentially level 28’ wide x 18” high graded earth terrace/platforms radiating outward from band shell. Theses terraces can accommodate farm market stalls, multiple rows of picnic tables, chair seating or blankets on the grass.

Why Do it?

- Adds more sense of structured place
- Makes band shell more a part of Green
- Could improve seating capacity for stage events
- Could make Farmer’s Market and Book Fair events more interesting

Why not Do it?

- Capital investment required
- Requires more maintenance
- Reduces informality of the Green
Village Green with

**Mini Playground**

A smallish playground (not to compete with funhouse). Covered seating for parents. Level, padded base.

Why Do it?

- Enlivens/adds activity to Village Green
- Provides activity for children in Village core
- Supports visitors to Museum and other local shops

Why not Do it?

- Reduces Village Green area available for major events
- Fun House playground is not very far away
- Playgrounds create liability

Pictures are from the playground at Whistler Village B.C.
Village Green with

Year Round Roofed Sheds

Five 15’X25’ sheds (four with covered connection) for all weather use for farmers market, art, craft and other festival events, food truck support, winter covered seating and eating, and one outdoor display shed for the History Museum

Why Do it?

- Adds all weather potential to Village Green (extend season for Farmer’s Market on site)
- Adds potential for shoulder and winter season fairs, festivals
- Potential to serve food trucks on green
- With the north sheds and potentially the Museum shed the Green becomes more of a defined place
- Year round covered seating and picnic tables

Why not Do it?

- Requires investment
- Reduces informality of Green
- Reduces flexible use of ground space
- Requires maintenance
Fern Street ROW as

Pea Patch Gardens (alt.1)

Assignable garden plots (4), work shelter with water collection and lockers, public walking path

Why Do it?

- Provides garden opportunity for a few residents (larger plots than alt.2)
- If well-tended adds interest for visitors
- Perhaps a nice complement to Farmer’s Market
- Provides pathway North Beach to Prune Alley
- Allows 45 degree parking addition

Why not Do it?

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village
- Without oversight may be an eyesore
- Requires water source (even with roof water collection)
- Eliminates public park, town square, transit stop or through street use of Fern St. ROW
Fern Street ROW as

**Pea Patch Gardens (alt. 2)**

Assignable garden plots (8), work shelter with water collection and lockers, public walking path

---

**Why Do it?**

- Provides garden opportunity for a few residents
- If well-tended adds interest for visitors
- Perhaps a nice complement to Farmer’s Market
- Provides pathway North Beach to Prune Alley
- Allows 45 degree parking addition

**Why not Do it?**

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village
- Without oversight may be an eyesore
- Requires water source (even with roof water collection)
-Eliminates public park, town square, transit stop or through street use of Fern St. ROW
Fern Street ROW as

**Park/Passage**

Moss Rock, Madrone, walking path, benches, drinking fountain

**Why Do it?**

- Provides open access North Beach to Prune Alley
- If well-tended adds interest for visitors
- Provides pathway North Beach to Prune Alley
- Adds to green feel of village

**Why not Do it?**

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village
- Without oversight may be an eyesore
- Requires water source (even with roof water collection)
- Eliminates through street use of Fern St. ROW
Fern Street ROW as

**Town (or April) Square**

Transit stop with waiting shelters, bicycle racks and public lockers, picnic tables and benches, town hearth (winter), fountain (summer), Hero statue (April? Viking?)

---

**Why Do it?**

- Hometown celebration/meeting place
- If adjacent property owners open retail to it, can be an active center
- Outdoor tables, drinking fountain, winter hearth, summer fountain all welcoming amenities
- Provides open access North Beach to Prune Alley
- Hero statue adds to hometown feel
- Supports focus of transit and maybe taxi service (with covered waiting)
- Bicycle friendly (racks and storage lockers)

**Why not Do it?**

- Capital investment required on County ROW
- Requires water source (even with roof water collection)
- Eliminates street use of Fern St. ROW
- Requires maintenance (fire pit and fountain, trash removal, grass pavers)
Fern Street ROW as

**Transit & Non-motorized vehicle Center**

1 way transit road, covered waiting, bicycle parking, benches

### Why Do it?

- Provides formal transit location, supports public transit
- Provides covered waiting and benches
- Provides bicycle support in heart of village
- Is a walking path between North Beach and Prune Alley

### Why not Do it?

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village core
- Adds to vehicle dominance
- Precludes garden, civic space or transport hub use of ROW
- Only effective if transit system is effective
Library Park

Grand Stair & Ramp

Five foot wide 15” high platforms with ramps and stairs connecting park level with library level. Allows wheelchair access, seating in Southwest facing area.

Why Do it?

• Draws people through park to library
• Opens the view of the library from Prune Aly a bit
• Offers seating in the sun
• Provides Wheeled access

Why not Do it?

• Requires substantial investment
• More urban than rural
• Reduces planting on park hillside
Victory Hill

Public Outlook

This is topographically the most prominent site in Eastsound. From the south side of the hill it provides a stunning view over the village to Eastsound. It would provide a destination highlight for a walking tour of the Village.

Why Do it?

- Captures a visual highlight of Eastsound for walking residents and visitors alike
- Creates a unique Eastsound visitor destination

Why not Do it?

- Requires permission, easement, participation from landowner
- Requires capital and maintenance
- Requires felling of 3-4 trees
Beach Access at the Outflow

**Outflow Stair to Beach**

Adding a pleasant stair to the beach makes use of the beach seem more inviting, makes the little outlook park more important.

**Why Do it?**
- Makes Beach and walk to Indian Island seem more friendly
- Will be easier for the elderly (though not ADA access)
- Increases significance of waterfront outlook

**Why not Do it?**
- Requires design and construction cost
- Requires shoreline management approval
Main Street

Waterfront View Corridors

Enforce the open view covenants on Main Street to improve sense of a waterfront Village.

Why Do it?

- Increases sense of Village on the Sound
- Is already a part of waterfront property covenants

Why not Do it?

- Is apparently difficult to enforce
- Requires property owner willingness to maintain
Fishing Bay

20 New Buoys

Increase boats staying in Fishing Bay considerably.

Why Do it?

- Increases boaters in Fishing Bay
- Enlivens activity in Fishing Bay
- May already be enabled by legislature

Why not Do it?

- Will require more dinghy dock capacity
- Increases boat caused pollution
County Dock

Expanded Capacity

Triple (or more) the capacity for Dinghies and a few larger craft, possibly a float plane landing.

Why Do it?

- Increases capacity to host anchored or Buoy moored boats in Fishing Bay
- Enlivens boat activity in Fishing Bay
- Potential for float plane traffic, water shuttle

Why not Do it?

- May be technically difficult (weather, current)
- Dock lacks supervision
- Is somewhat distant from town (particularly for those with luggage)
Main Street

**Waterfront Dinghy Dock**

Accessible through wide opening in building with public stair waterfront deck. Building good candidate for chandlery, bar, restaurant.

**Why Do it?**

- Increases capacity to host anchored or buoy moored boats in Fishing Bay
- Brings dinghies directly to village core
- Enlivens boat activity in Fishing Bay
- Pier head opens waterfront to Main Street
- Could accommodate water shuttle

**Why not Do it?**

- May be technically difficult (weather, current)
- May be Environmentally difficult
- Requires property acquisition and willing developer, or large public subscription
- Permitting process will be laborious
Fishing Bay

Historic Templin’s pier Replicated

Pier from Main Street provides Pavilion for chandlery, bar, restaurant and extensive dock space and floatplane landing.

Why Do it?

- Greatly increases boaters in Fishing Bay
- Enlivens activity in Fishing Bay
- Accommodates float plane traffic
- Makes Eastsound seem more accessible to boaters
- Pavilion adds interesting destination
- Pier head opens waterfront to Main Street

Why not Do it?

- Will be technically difficult (weather, current)
- Will be environmentally difficult (both pier and boat pollution)
- Requires property acquisition and willing developer, or large public subscription
- Permitting process will be laborious, likely litigious
- Float planes bring additional airplane noise to Fishing Bay
Fishing Bay

Pier to Indian Island

Pier from Main Street provides tide independent access to island, significant dock space provided on pier off island.

Why Do it?

- Greatly increases boaters in Fishing Bay
- Enlivens activity in Fishing Bay
- Accommodates float plane traffic
- Makes Eastsound seem more accessible to boaters
- Makes Indian Island accessible full time
- Pier head opens waterfront to Main Street

Why not Do it?

- Will be technically difficult (weather, current)
- Will be Environmentally difficult (both pier and boat pollution, and building on Indian Island)
- Requires property acquisition and willing developer, or large public subscription
- Permitting process will be laborious, likely litigious
- Float planes bring additional airplane noise to Fishing Bay
- Eliminates romance/intrigue of waiting for tide to clear land bridge
Canal between Crescent Beach and North Beach

**Grand Canal**

A canal which would open Eastsound to through boat traffic north and south. Could include marina at either end or mid island

Why Do it?

- Fulfills a dream started years ago at the “ditch”
- Increases boat traffic through Eastsound by making it a waypoint for north/south traffic
- Could accommodate a mid-island marina
- Would be a very unique phenomena in the Salish Sea

Why not Do it?

- Huge Property Acquisition, Capital investment required
- Requires unlikely permission to cross preserve lands
- Environmental and technical issues are extreme
- Cuts island in two, relying on raised bridge connections
- Locks are an unlikely solution due to water source and pumping requirements
Traffic and parking are currently front of mind issues for many stakeholders, and viewpoints are not aligned. Islanders who have lived here for any length of time have seen traffic and parking patterns worsen. Back-ups of multiple cars at Main St. and North Beach Road are an instant reminder of the inevitable impacts of change. On weekends, it seems more and more necessary to drive up and down our blocks in search of an open parking space. Yet for newcomers, used to parking in urban areas, parking in Eastsound is a comparative dream. Walking two or three blocks is hardly perceived as an inconvenience. In fact, a short walk through town, participating in the ebb and flow of village life, discovering a new storefront or garden, is one of the serendipitous benefits of pedestrianism.

It is difficult to begin a conversation about the future of Eastsound without the topic of parking quickly rearing its head. For some, particularly business owners, a perceived parking shortage in the height of visitor season is seen as a significant business deterrent. For others there is already too much car friendliness in the village diminishing its appeal as a walking place. Yet others point out that when businesses are successful there is always a perceived parking shortage.

Islanders have their favorite secret path or village shortcut, or their 4th of July parking spot. In this walking village of ours, how can we multiply these experiences? How can we improve the experience of remote parking for ourselves and for our visitors?

Would time limits (2-3 hour parking) on public parking spaces free up valuable parking spaces currently occupied by Eastsound Employees?

Could seasonal (and experimental) changes in the parking patterns (i.e. closing down Main Street for festivals) increase our sense of surprise and discovery?
Traffic

In addition to parking, traffic and congestion affects our perception of the changing state of our village. Without a doubt, cars and delivery trucks define the geometry of our streetscapes. Traffic slowdowns, such as the Main and North Beach intersection are seen as a significant annoyance, yet the slowing down of traffic in the village contributes to walker and biker friendliness.

Despite the increased level of conversation in our cities of the revolutionary impact of driverless cars, and public and semi-public transportation, those conversations on this island seem very far away.

Because of the way the village has developed over time, and due to the wetland that runs along its western edge, Eastsound has several – highly different - entry points that receive very different levels of use. Is there a way to increase the quantity of entry points in the way the original Eastsound plan intended? Alternatively, if that is not possible, is there a way to properly redistribute traffic to relieve congestion. Would redistribution improve the way the village has been developing? Is congestion a bad thing?

Certainly, many cities have adopted the strategy of converting two-way street to one way couplets to relieve traffic flows and circulation patterns, yet opponents feel one way couplets take away from freedom of movement and by extension, street vitality. Several solutions are studied here.

Here are a few of the concerns that have been raised by the public:

• Routing traffic around Eastsound when possible
• Increasing East West connections per the original Eastsound Plan
• Redistributing traffic from Main Street to some of the other streets
• Eliminating dead end streets where it is extremely difficult for truck traffic to deliver goods and turn around
• Reducing car traffic upon and restoring Crescent Beach to a car free area (see Infrastructure/greenspace).
• Improving Car circulation within Eastsound

These concerns are addressed in the precepts that follow:
- Re-route traffic
- Rose and A Street extensions
- Connecting A St. to Orion St.
- One Way
- One Way Couplets
- Fern Street
- Fern Street One Way
- Western Connection
Close Main St. or One Way Main Street

Re-route traffic

Why Do it?
- Reduces congestion on Main Street by re-routing incoming traffic to the North
- Enlivens north end of the village
- Allows incoming cars to park in new village parking areas around the periphery
- Allows incoming traffic to be split down N. Beach and Prune St.

Why not Do it?
- Diverts energy from Main Street.
- Counterintuitive gateway approach to village
East West Extensions

Rose and A Street extensions

Why Do it?
- Reduces congestion on Main Street
- Offers a second means of access to the core (cuts the distance to Enchanted Forest Road by a half)
- Eliminates dead end street in the core

Why not Do it?
- Impinges on wetlands (!)
- Requires acquisition of private property (Ace Hardware/Lovers Lane)
- Politically challenging
Eliminating Dead Ends

Connecting A St. to Orion St.

Why Do it?

- If access if allowed for truck delivery and emergency vehicles, connecting A St. to Orion St would allow long vehicles to safely exit the dead end without dangerous hammerhead turns.
- If access is allowed for more than delivery vehicles, connection also helps bring new visibility and retail/restaurant spaces at the end of A St. (Consider the restaurant spaces that have had limited visibility and have failed.)

Why not Do it?

- Brings added traffic to the quiet pace of Orion St. with its families and school children
- Is it possible to route truck traffic another way?
Main Street

One Way

Convert Main from N. Beach to Prune Alley to one way East bound

Why Do it?

- Reduces backed up traffic on Main St by allowing easier entry to the village core and easier thru traffic to Olga
- Simplifies intersection at N.Beach and Main St.

Why not Do it?

- Potentially confusing
- Redirects Olga traffic into village
- Isn’t congestion at Main St. part of the essential vitality of the village?
Converting roads to one way roads

One Way Couplets

Why Do it?

- Creates a series of one way couplets to permanently, seasonally, or for special events, reduce through traffic on Main St.
- Might encourage traffic to north end of village

Why not Do it?

- Introduces extraneous Olga traffic into village core
- Potentially confusing?
- Reduces vitality at the main intersection of the village
- Car-centric?
- Increase speed of cars in Eastsound for travelers rushing to the ferry?
- Would a no left turn sign at Main St and North beach achieve the same traffic flows (similar to 4th of July)
Fern Street ROW as

**Fern Street**

2 way traffic, sidewalks, planting strip, 9 parking spaces @ 45 degrees

**Why Do it?**

- Provides additional automobile route between North Beach and Prune Alley
- Provides pedestrian sidewalks North Beach to Prune Alley
- Adds 9 parking spaces (probably net 5)

**Why not Do it?**

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village core
- Adds to vehicle dominance
- Precludes garden, civic space or transport hub use of ROW
Fern Street ROW as

Fern Street One Way

One way traffic west bound to form couplet with A Street, broad east/west sidewalk, tree lane on south side, 9 parking spaces @ 45 degrees, bicycle parking

Why Do it?

- Provides additional automobile route between North Beach and Prune Alley
- Provides broad pedestrian sidewalk North Beach to Prune Alley
- Adds 9 parking spaces (probably net 5)
- Adds major tree lane in center of Village
- Adds bicycle parking

Why not Do it?

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village core
- Adds to vehicle dominance
- Precludes garden, civic space or transport hub use of ROW
New North South Road

Western Connection

Why Do it?

- Reduces congestion on Main Street and North Beach Road
- Allows incoming traffic to bypass Main Street congestion
- Eliminates dead end street in the core (A Street)
- Provides access and connection to existing parking stock and significant new parking areas
- Creates new street frontage

Why not Do it?

- Impinges on greenspaces
- Requires acquisition of private property
- Works with adjacent uses?


**Parking**

In addition to traffic, the availability of easily accessed parking affects our perception of the changing state of our village.

Currently, much of our seasonal parking demand is buffered by the large parking lots of several private institutions. The parking at Island Market, behind Our House, Eastsound Square, the Post Office, Seaview Theater, Rays, all provide invaluable parking areas to supplement parking on the streets. Our community is grateful for these areas which allow us to keep Eastsound a compact walking village where one can park and walk to several establishments without having to constantly re-park our cars.

How can we increase the amount of available public parking through the creation of new off-street parking areas or on-street parking?

Would time limits (2-3 hour parking) on public parking spaces free up valuable parking spaces currently occupied by Eastsound Employees? For some, particularly business owners, a perceived parking shortage in the height of visitor season is seen as a significant business deterrent. For others there is already too much car friendliness in the village diminishing its appeal as a walking place. Yet others point out that when businesses are successful there is always a perceived parking shortage.

The current parking count in the village core, both public and private is approximately 1200. The cluster parking options included in these precepts could add another 380 or so. If the village core were developed to its maximum allowed with on-site (underground) parking, such as Scenario B in the density study, it would add 300-500 spaces. If it were developed to maximum allowed density with only partial on-site parking, such as Scenario C in the density study, it would create a code required deficit of about 100 spaces, which the cluster sites could accommodate.

One of the serious considerations for the future development of the village is whether the required parking standards will enable the most desirable future. Currently restaurants and bars are required to provide the greater of 1 parking space for every 100 square feet of dining space or 7 seats. Retail uses must provide 1 parking space for every 300 net square feet of retail space. Housing must provide 1 parking space for each unit under 550 square feet (essentially a studio apartment) and 1.5 for each unit larger than that. Because parking requirements are such an important limitation on development, they are probably the most powerful tool in controlling it.
Here are a few of the concerns that have been raised by the public:

- Quantity of parking in Eastsound
- Walking distance to available parking
- Impact of seasonal parking fluctuations (summer employee parking)
- Creating greater incentives for owners to offer easements for public parking in the Right Of Way for adding street parking
- Creating additional designated public parking areas (on acquired parking via a parking fund) (on Port property) (on expanded public property ROW’s)
- Reducing parking via Public transit/Cycling/Rideshares
- Reduce parking and green up by restricted charging stations
- Environmental impacts of storm water and pollution generating impervious surfaces

These concerns are addressed in the precepts that follow:

- Identify potential public parking areas
- A Street Parking Cluster
- Madrona Street Parking Cluster
- Main at Madrona Parking Cluster
- Retention Pond Parking Cluster
- Enchanted Forest Parking Cluster
- Time Limit Street Parking
- Retailers/Institutions encourage use of lesser used private parking
- Parallel parking along 50’ right of way
- Parking Lot Fern St ROW
- North Beach for EV parking /Charging Stations
- Parking at the Port
Targeted parking areas:

Identify potential public parking areas

Why Do it?

- Looking at existing trails and walking paths through the core, identify areas that could be targeted for the public parking fund
- Compared to urban areas, parking in Eastsound is considered easy if willing to walk ¼ mile or 10 minutes and if the experience could be enhanced. Imagine a new wetland boardwalk connecting remote parking areas to the village core? (White bikes? Horse drawn summertime shuttles? Ride & Bike lots?)
- Existing parking areas could be better utilized for summer parking (employee parking at the school or churches) and new parking areas.
- Could employee parking be encouraged by summertime 2 hour parking limits with parking payment by donation or honor system?
- The County has discussed acquiring or leasing areas for public parking? These could be from the Port of Orcas or private properties.

Why not Do it?

- Paid parking is for cities!
- How far are islanders or visitors willing to walk with groceries?
Cluster parking area

A Street Parking Cluster

Why Do it?

- Well located to serve village core
- Provides a useful mass of parking
- Easily controlled if pay parking is implemented

Why not Do it?

- Not the easiest location for visitors to find
- Requires a willing land owner
- Requires capital
- Requires maintenance
Cluster parking area

Madrona Street Parking Cluster

Why Do it?

- Well located to serve village core
- Provides a useful mass of parking (58 spaces)
- Easily controlled if pay parking is implemented

Why not Do it?

- Not the easiest location for visitors to find
- Requires a willing land owner (the Community Church)
- Requires capital
- Requires maintenance
Cluster parking area

Main at Madrona Parking Cluster

Why Do it?

- Well located to serve village core
- Very easy site for visitors to find
- Provides 26 parking
- Easily controlled if pay parking is implemented

Why not Do it?

- Requires a willing land owner
- Requires capital
- Requires maintenance
Cluster parking area

Retention Pond Parking Cluster

Why Do it?

- Very well located to serve village core
- Provides substantial parking mass (60 spaces)
- Easily controlled if pay parking is implemented
- Potentially scenic with ponds on two sides

Why not Do it?

- Not easy for visitors to find
- Access complicated
- Requires a willing land owner
- Requires capital
- Requires maintenance
Cluster parking area

Enchanted Forest Parking Cluster

Why Do it?

- At the edge of village core quarter mile radius
- Provides greatest parking mass (179 spaces)
- Easily controlled if pay parking is implemented
- Scenic walk to village core

Why not Do it?

- Only easy for visitors to find if Enchanted Forest becomes a main access to village
- Requires a willing land owner
- Requires capital
- Requires maintenance
- Walking distance at edge of tolerance for many
Maximize utility of on street parking

Time Limit Street Parking

Why Do it?

- Frees street parking from all day users
- Increases ability of parkers to access key spaces for reasonable shopping or dining periods
- Understandable and fair
- Requires minimal capital

Why not Do it?

- Requires policing, fining, towing infrastructure
- Offends some sense of “rural island village”
Maximize use of existing off street retail and institutional parking

Retailers/Institutions encourage use of lesser used private parking

Retailers open little used parking areas with inviting/welcoming signage.
Institutions do likewise with temporary signage consistent with their off hour availability.

Why Do it?

- Can increase actual parking density
- Institutions (school, church) give back to community (with restrictions)
- Participating retailers likely to increase retail traffic in their area
- Contributes to “likeable” village
- Requires minimal capital, oversight, maintenance

Why not Do it?

- Requires willing owner/retailers who perceive advantage
- Requires management by Institutions and retailers or other source
Widened ROW

Parallel parking along 50’ right of ways

Why Do it?

- Currently, property owners can deed parking to the Public through several option for parallel or angled parking. This parking reduces their parking requirements.
- Widening existing 50’ right of ways would allow the County to secure and street parking spots.
- 4’ of ROW would create parallel parking spots. 14’ of ROW acquisition would create angled parking spots
- Currently Haven Rd (Oddfellows) and eastern portion of Main St. allow parallel parking with relaxed standards – should more of this be encouraged?
- Could the County pay for sidewalk improvements?

Why not Do it?

- Cost to County to purchase right of ways
- Eminent domain.
- Cost to construct curbs and walks
Fern Street ROW as

Parking Lot

Provide 15 car public parking in center of Village

Why Do it?

- Provides public parking in heart of Village
- Adds 15 parking spaces
- Property is already in public domain

Why not Do it?

- Diminishes Potential Retail Intensity of Village
- Precludes garden, civic space or transport hub use of ROW
North Beach restricted parking

North Beach for EV parking / Charging Stations

North Beach street parking closed to all but electric vehicles and service vehicles while unloading, with a series of charging stations.

Why Do it?

- Supports environmental concerns
- By reducing parking search on North Beach, make it more of a walking precinct

Why not Do it?

- Exacerbates perceived parking shortage
- May not attract enough use to justify charging stations
- Requires capital investment, maintenance
Paths and parking areas

Parking at the Port

Why Do it?

- Work with the Port of Orcas to provide additional areas for public parking (while there are several possible locations for this, including where the Port currently accommodates parking on the 4th of July, the location shown above is their preference)
- Areas where structures are not allowed to be constructed in the Airport Overlay offer perfect open spaces for parking
- Bio-swales and Raingardens could filter and treat storm water runoff from the parking areas.
- A new boardwalk and bridge over the existing wetland areas could connect to the existing pedestrian path to the airport

Why not Do it?

- Cost for constructing parking areas and bio-swales/raingardens
- Wetland Mitigation
• Walking/Sidewalks/Trails

Most stakeholders have expressed a desire to preserve and reinforce walkability in the Village as well as to make it more bicycle friendly. Walkability is enhanced by understandability (mental mapping), ease of walking and navigation, places to rest (benches, picnic tables) and to use restroom facilities, and interesting things to see and do.

Biking is enhanced by safe bikeways, clear mapping, and safe places to park.

This is a list of the precepts to follow:

• Unified streetscape in Village Core
• Identify areas to enhance and encourage paths to the core
• Street Furniture
• Walking and Biking Trails
• Buck Park/Fun House/Orcas Center/village Trail
• Interpretive Center/Trails Restored Public Access
• Main Street Promenade
• North Beach Promenade
• Prune Aly Promenade
• The Walking Zone
Extend adopted sidewalk/parking /streetscape standards

Unified streetscape in Village Core

Unify the village walking experience through newly adopted standards, allowing visitors to focus on discovering the village with a feeling of relative safety.

Why Do it?

- Creates equal access to all stakeholders in village
- Makes walking safer for all
- Frees visitors minds to explore

Why not Do it?

- Cost to county in time and dollars
- Some prefer the serendipity of current variety
- Takes too damn long
Paths and parking areas

Identify areas to enhance and encourage paths to the core

Why Do it?

- Address the sensitive wetland areas with combinations of boardwalks paths balanced with new parking areas

Why not Do it?

- Cost
- Wetland Mitigation
Develop standard artisan street furniture

Street Furniture

Local artisan designed and built street furniture would add a very unique character to Eastsound, and generate local work. Included would be benches, trash receptacles, bike racks, bollard lighting (using standard UL components) and trail and village signage. Trail signage increases trail discovery and Village directories increase village exploration by visitors.

Why Do it?

- Fills a critical need while giving Eastsound a unique character
- Trail and village signage increases discovery and understanding by visitors
- Would help support local artisans

Why not Do it?

- Capital investment required
- Requires finding appropriate locations, consumes space
- Selection may be difficult
- Cost likely more than lowball catalogue approach
Complete trail loops

Walking and Biking Trails

Add to existing bike/walk trails to complete loops through Eastsound. Develop uniform trail signage and post at all key entry and decision points. Connect to Eastsound at outflow, make real trail along Crescent Beach

Why Do it?

- Enhances feeling of a walking place
- Increases biker/hiker friendliness of village
- Would improve safety for walkers along Crescent Beach
- Signage and maps will aid discovery
- Adds walking connections to Orcas Center, Buck Park

Why not Do it?

- Permission and maybe easement acquisition required for key legs
- Cost involved in trail upgrades and signage
Trail connections

Buck Park/Fun House/Orcas Center/village Trail

Add convenience trails to improve walking between Buck Park and Fun House and between Village and Orcas Center

Why Do it?

- Provides important walking links
- Buck Park/Fun House route provides safe path for children

Why not Do it?

- Volume of use may not justify
- Requires property owner cooperation
Madrona Point

Interpretive Center/Trails Restored Public Access

24 car parking lot provided on county land, interpretive center shed, toilets and waste collection facility provided at trailhead on Madrone Point land.

Why Do it?

- Madrona Point is an important public asset visually, as a natural habitat, as an historic place and as a sacred Lummi place
- With proper preparation and guidance it can be made available for public participation in a respectful and reverent manner in accordance with agreements from 1989
- Creates an important cultural education opportunity

Why not Do it?

- History of abuse makes it difficult to assure future respectful use
- Requires interpretive dialogue development, signage, construction and capital cost
- Requires sponsorship including Lummi
Close Main Street to Autos from Orion to North Beach

Main Street Promenade

Extend Orion from Enchanted Forest to Main, no autos on Main from there to North Beach except service & handicapped... a broad waterfront promenade

Why Do it?

- Provides spectacular seaside broadwalk
- Service traffic allowed
- Emphasizes Eastsound as village on the sound

Why not Do it?

- Requires multiple new streets to provide access to properties on Main
- Scale of promenade may be out of keeping with Village
- Reroutes Village access from West to Enchanted Valley, Orion, North Beach
North Beach closed to autos

North Beach Promenade

North Beach closed to all but service, handicapped and local direct access from Main Street to A Street creates a broad pedestrian, bike environment at heart of Village

Why Do it?

- Creates a large walking precinct
- Makes most of the Village core a true walking Village

Why not Do it?

- Financial viability of retail without convenience parking is questioned by many
- Will likely heighten traffic congestion on Prune Aly
- Requires new street to serve properties on west side of North Beach
Close Prune Alley to Autos

Prune Alley Promenade

Eliminate auto traffic on Prune Alley from Main to Rose Street except for service, handicapped and local direct access creating a broad pedestrian environment. This dead ends A and Fern Streets at Prune Aly.

Why Do it?

- Creates a large walking precinct
- Makes most of the Village core a true walking Village

Why not Do it?

- Financial viability of retail without convenience parking is questioned by many
- Will likely heighten traffic congestion on North Beach
- Dead ends traffic on Fern and A streets
- Changes access to Island Market from North Beach to Madrone or the access road in front of Key Bank increasing pressure on both
“Walkify” the Prune Alley/North Beach Corridor (Main to A)

The Walking Zone

Unify this block of properties by creating a walking plane with many through block connections... works well with potential Town Square in Fern Street ROW (see public spaces section)

Why Do it?

- Creates a large walking precinct
- Makes most of the Village core a true walking Village
- Doesn’t require major traffic changes
- Some of it already exists (path through the Kitchen property) or is easy to create (through the Templin Center Parking lot)

Why not Do it?

- Requires cooperation of private property owners
- Will likely heighten traffic congestion on Prune Alley
- Requires full implementation of sidewalk and street furniture standards
Part Three:

Village Scenarios; alternative emphasis

The following three scenarios of village future were created solely to demonstrate how we might make choices based on emphasizing one aspect of the village over others. They are not recommended scenarios, they are demonstrative only.

The first scenario is “Hometown” emphasizing the needs of residents in their daily lives and need for belonging.

The second scenario is “Culture Village” emphasizing Eastsound's growing role as venue and sponsor for arts, crafts, food, theatre, cinema and music.

The third scenario is “Tourist/Visitor destination” emphasizing those ideas that encourage and accommodate the hospitality economy currently key to Orcas economy.
The Precept Choices to demonstrate this emphasis are as follows:

- **Low Density Retail/ Housing (Scenario A)**  
  This is chosen to maintain the most familiar scale of the village. It still allows for a modest increase in retail and housing units.
- **Mini Playground On Village Green**  This precept is chosen to add life and convenience to the Green
- **Town (or April) Square**  This is picked to provide a community celebration and gathering place that is independent of seasons or (mostly) of time of day.
- **Buck Park/Funhouse/Orcas Center/ Village Trail**  This ties the Village and its family activity areas together in a walkable way
- **Grand Stair & Ramp (at Library Park)**  This knits the library more closely to the village core.
- **Aquatic Center**  This adds a major family activity to the community and could support school programs.
- **Parallel Parking along 50’ right of ways**  This organizes streets, makes reasonable parking along all streets and allows uniform implementation of sidewalk scheme.
- **Street Furniture**  This adds a strong sense of place and, using local artisans, uniqueness.
- **Waterfront View Corridors**  This captures an important asset of the village that has already been paid for.
- **Restored Beach/Public Park (close Crescent Beach Road)**  This consolidates the preserves relationship to the village, and stops through traffic on Main Street.
- **New Constructed Wetlands/Parking/development partnerships**  This treats storm water runoff from the village which currently is dumped into Eastsound, adds a major trail amenity and provides parking relief in the heart of the village.
- **Connect Orion and A streets**  This eases pressure on North Beach.
The Precept Choices to demonstrate this emphasis are as follows:

- **Inn & Institute on Victory Hill**  
  This precept provides both a unique hilltop venue for housing visitors and artists and teaching studio space for artists (musicians, painters, writers, film makers etc.) which would make a major statement about Eastsound commitment to culture.
• **Year Round Roofed Sheds (on the Green)**  This provides a venue for exhibit and mini performance year round as well as doing same for the farmers market and enables covered outdoor display space for the historical museum.

• **Amphitheatre Tiers (at Band Shell)**  This improves and organizes the audience experience for performances in the band shell as well as creating an interesting, level set of display terraces.

• **Trail from Orcas Center to Village**  This creates a walkable and direct link of the center to other cultural venues in the village.

• **North Beach Promenade (event times only)**  Turn North Beach into a walking promenade (service and local residents excepted) during key cultural events.

• **Orcas Art Museum**  The creation of this organization and facility would be a major step up in Eastsound’s commitment to the arts.

• **Grand Stair & Ramp (at Library Park)**  This knits the library more closely to the village core and ties together a relationship between village green and history museum, library, art museum and Orcas Center.

• **Outflow stair to the Beach**  This is an essential improvement in the invitation to enjoy the beach.

• **Waterfront View Corridors**  This captures an important asset of the village that has already been paid for and is an important aspect of the village character.

• **Retention Pond Parking Cluster**  Parking here most directly supports cultural activities on the village green.
The Precept Choices to demonstrate this emphasis are as follows:
• **Density Analysis Scenario B (maximum density with sub grade parking)**  This allows the maximum expansion of retail space and a very large increase in village core housing, both for residents and, via rental condos, for visitors.

• **An Inn on Victory Hill**  A high quality venue with a 360 degree view will be a real attraction.

• **Waterfront Dinghy Dock**  An accessible dock on the waterfront opens the waterfront to visitors, and supports increased boats at anchor or on buoy in Fishing Bay.

• **Add 5 Parking Clusters; Main at Madrona, Madrona, Retention Pond, A Street and Enchanted Forest**  The maximum amount of cluster parking is chosen to enhance visitor experience while keeping North Beach and Prune Alley relatively free of surface parking.

• **Homage to April**  Aw...do it for the heck of it.

• **Increase Amenities**  Adding benches, picnic tables and bike racks is an important act of hospitality.

• **Increase Public Restrooms**  Adding public restrooms is essential to accommodate increased visitor population. Tying them to the parking accommodation is a good distribution strategy.

• **Outflow stair to the Beach**  This is an essential improvement in the invitation to enjoy the beach.

• **Waterfront View Corridors**  This captures an important asset of the village that has already been paid for and is an important aspect of the village character.

• **Restored Beach/Public Park (close Crescent Beach Road)**  This makes the beach much more of a visitor destination and stops through traffic on Main Street.

• **20 New Buoys (in Fishing Bay)**  This increase in mooring capacity should greatly increase boaters’ use of Eastsound and combined with the waterfront dinghy dock increase their participation in the village.

• **Public Outlook**  This would be a visitor attraction.

• **Transit & Non-motorized vehicle Center**  A workable Transit system connecting the island is important in accommodating the growth anticipated in this scenario. A highly visible presence in the heart of the village is key to its success.

• **New Constructed Wetlands**  While treating storm water runoff from the village this adds a major trail and visual amenity in the heart of the village.

• **Interpretive Center/Trails Restored Public Access**  This important visual asset and Lummi sacred place can be an important visitor educational experience.
Afterword

As this task group has discovered and illustrated, a look to the future of the village core raises many issues:

Does Eastsound/Orcas need an administrative manager such as a deputy County manager?

What density is desirable both in terms of retail/commercial space and housing?

What is a desirable mix of resident and non-resident housing?

What is the desirable mix of market rate and low income housing?

Should the height limit be raised to allow third stories? Should anything even taller be allowed? Should the lot coverage limit on Buildings over 5000 square feet be eased or tightened?

Should Single family residences be allowed in the Village Commercial zone (the densest residential zone)?

If single family residences are allowed in this zone should they conform to the architectural standards of the zone?

Are parking requirements too much or too little?

Should all parking be accommodated as close to destination as possible or is more preservation of walking space with more remote parking desirable? What is the best balance?

What is the desired traffic approach in the village (slow and relatively congested, or a relatively facilitated and faster flow).

What priority should water, sewer, power signal system capacity improvements be given?

Is there a desirable visual character of the village streets and public places (unified, eclectic, historic, contemporary, rustic etc.)?

Is it desirable to set architectural aesthetic standards (massing, roof pitch, stylistic issues such as historic, northwest, finish materials, glass percentages, etc.).

Is it desirable to establish mandatory design review?

What are the priorities between possible public developments included in the precepts of this report?
These are a few of the many issues involved in planning for the future of our special place Eastsound Village. We encourage you to become a participant in the process of developing the vision to guide this planning. Please fill out the survey that accompanies this report, submit it to the EPRC and get engaged in the public dialogue in town halls, in deep dive workshops and in your dialogue with neighbors. Find the parts that fit your passion and help create a pathway to action. You can make a difference.

As one of the task group members said poetically and for all of us:

“How shall we answer the question of the Future of Eastsound...?...

Shall it be:

...allowed to evolve on its own in accordance with existing regulations and whatever market forces are brought to bear...?...

Or, shall it be:

...consciously enhanced as a nurturing hometown within a beautiful natural environment, provider of essential services for the island community while supporting low impact employment and residential neighborhoods, with a culture which emphasizes both the visual and performing arts, and is attractive to young families, wealthy and not so wealthy retirees and visitors alike...?...”

Postscript: This work effort was limited to the core of the village (except for a few related issues) because of the limits of a small volunteer group and because the core creates much of the essence of the village. However, the whole Eastsound Urban Growth Area is important and has additional issues which need analysis such as accommodation of industrial needs and housing capacity of lower density zones. The village core is circled on this map of the entire UGA.
Appendix: Stakeholder’s Views

Vision for Eastsound

Stakeholder concerns/ideas collected over the last year or so by category

Amenities/Ethos

Stakeholder input

- A sense of safety, especially during night
- Friendly shop keepers
- Dog-friendliness
- Parades for every occasion
- Locally grown restaurant fare
- Festive holiday décor
- Dark night skies of Eastsound
- It’s not Friday Harbor
- Free community events
- Summer concerts in the park
- Upkeep of shop owners making it personal, yet attractive
- Increase in crime
- Lack of neighborhood watch
• Make an intergenerational environment, where service workers, young people are not pushed out
• Identify year-round and local residents by car stickers
• Help new businesses with regulations, permits and zoning
• Preserve cultural heritage
• Tourism is key to economy, it drives all else
• Eastsound is a place out of time
• Recognize visitor need for fantasy
• Town feels like it services local community as well as tourism
• Essentials are available for local community members
• Schools are located in the core of Eastsound, making students part of the town
• Public trash receptacles
• Empty business rentals
• Inadequate Public Restrooms
• Lack of playground
• Improve safety with showers, other amenities for temporary and homeless
• Victory Hill presents a special opportunity
• Crescent Beach as a park
• Need places to sit, eat, picnic outside
• Need inexpensive family restaurant
• Need to support long term hometown businesses
• Need Interpretive center and trails on Madrona Point
• Need a public recreation facility with swimming pool
• Need a good uniform signage system
• Need better street lighting

Precepts
  o Create opportunity for more resort like hotel (Inn at Langley on Victory Hill?)
  o Enable more arts use of Green and Village Square
  o Implement Klien’s work on lighting standards
  o Incorporate the capacity for resilience in the future
  o Make something of Century Tel Building

Character/Design

Stakeholder input
- Low lighting, no light pollution, Integrity of dark nights
- Lack of street lighting
- Airport has too much light pollution
- Lighting that helps dark skies but keeps safety for pedestrians and traffic visibility
- Lush and cheery plantings
- Height limits on buildings
- Historic buildings
- Sandwich boards
- Muted building hues
- Small scale
- Mixed residential and commercial uses
- Cultural and historic buildings
- History & heritage of some of the buildings have maintained
  (Continuity of architecture – color palates)
- Look at examples of similar towns
- Don’t lose sight of what we like about the town now
- 6/12:12 pitch and related standards are right, particularly for Main Street
- Natural wood and glass
- Don’t “theme” our village
- Uniformity of architecture is boring

Precepts
- Add color standards: white based along waterfront? Dark grey roofs?
- Grey, white color standard
- Add allowance for contemporary design shed roofs, low pitch 1 ½-2:12
- Encourage street facing balconies, porches
- Reconsider 35’ height limit north of Rose Street
- Enable contemporary architecture of quality
- Create a “village core” zone?
- Make the Prune Aly to North Beach Road corridor a special design zone
- Reward/encourage development of a few architectural icons
- Consider indigenous material palette (Doug Fir, Cedar, Spruce, Madrone)
- Create exception criteria that EDRC can use
- Establish Character goal:
  - Themed and homogenous?
  - Zoned to preserve strong historic Character of East Main Street, but different on NB/Prune Aly corridors?
Unrestricted?

Other

- Establish style standard
  - Historic Reference based on Episcopal Church, Outlook Inn
  - Historic Reference based on Orcas Island: Prune Drying sheds, Kilns, Barns, and farm houses
  - Contemporary unrestricted: all materials, forms
  - Eclectic Mix: like now (but maybe a few inspiring buildings allowed?)
  - Contemporary Northwest: low pitch and flat roofs, stained wood, glass, concrete, steel, high window to wall ratio
  - Orcas Contemporary: Doug Fir, Cedar and Madrona, Low pitch grey standing seam metal roofs, large overhangs and rain sheltered ground plane, high window to wall ratio

Other

- Allow green roofs
- Put Tromp L’oeil Facades on the ugly ones and double wides as an interim measure

Economic/Social

**Stakeholder input**

- Need alternative job growth (to construction, hospitality)
- Encourage IT based middle income jobs
- Support local craft/skill based industries (brewing, pot, dairy, cosmetics)
- Add benches, trash receptacles to sidewalk standards
- Implement Crescent Beach Road closure and creation of County Park
- Create standard for public restrooms associated with any public parking “cluster”
- Find sponsorship & create public Rec center/swim pool
- Add a playground to Village Green or to Waterfront park
- Create aquatic center at Buck Park
- Open Madrona Point trails with interpretive signage, waste receptacles
**Precepts**
- Encourage start-ups
- Solve Housing “breaking point” for start-ups
- Examine Mixed use street model of Ballard Avenue in Seattle
- Find incentives for creation of low cost start-up space
- Develop incubator space (warehouse like)
- Expand OPAL loans to businesses program

**Housing**

**Stakeholder input**
- Lack of housing
- Homeless people living in woods
- Employee and affordable housing
- Not enough residents actually living in the village
- Ease parking and permitting restrictions to adding second floor apartments
- Solve long-term low-cost rental housing
- Add artist’s lofts, second floor apartments above store fronts
- Second story housing above businesses
- Assisted living facilities
- More affordable housing for islander renters
- Temporary housing & facilities for residents (including the homeless)
- Repurpose commercial buildings for residential (above the commercial spaces) and underground parking
- Additional OPAL Housing
- Increase density allowed in UGA (wetlands have absorbed a lot)
- “Pod Housing”...small groups of small prefabbed houses
- Enable 3 story buildings with third floor set back as housing over retail model
- Modify income qualifications to favor full time workers over purposely part time workers (the “leisure poor”)
- Need work/live accommodations

**Precepts**
- Enable Communal housing options through Zoning
- Develop business Co-op to create SRO housing for seasonal use, with potential for conference or other uses off season.
- Develop alternative to OPAL focused on rental model.
- Encourage housing over shop development through density enhancement
o Relook at 32’ height limit in commercial core (now gone)
o Relook at 35’ height limit in the Eastsound Sub Area Plan
o Relook at density allowed in UGA based on impact of wetlands restrictions
o Push standards to allow multifamily housing at edge of wetlands
o Develop housing alternatives that solve the misfit between demand and affordability (see paper on this).
o From Village perspective look at vibrancy as goal as much as /more than density
o Look at Northern half of Madrona Point as a reservoir for more dense village housing
o Enable Guesthouse rentals to residents or locally employed (3-5 month minimums?)
o Encourage in village housing for downsizers

Retail

Stakeholder input

• Close the storefront gaps along Main, Prune Aly and North Beach
• Enable 3 story development with setback at Third
• Develop romantic scale wind protected spaces
• Get accommodations with a pool (for kids)
• Allow temporary retail sheds

Precepts

o Require more storefront visibility
o Increase retail density along streets

Infrastructure

Stakeholder input

• Infrastructure not complete for surge of tourism during peak months
• Sharing solutions using electric cars, reserve electric cars at ferry landing
• Build indoor mall similar to Boulder Colorado
• Using existing and under-utilized facilities (parking lot of schools when they are closed)
• More funding available for projects
• Growth in hamlets
• Larger UGA to spread infrastructure costs (Is Eastsound too small to contain the desired infrastructures?)
• Better telecommunication policies/infrastructure
• Increased support for new businesses
• Ferries to Eastsound
• County government part of the solution
Precepts
- Accommodate transit drop off pick up at transportation hub (Fern St. ROW).
- Make county Dock suitable for water taxi/shuttle use
- Hold joint meeting with Hamlet design review committees to determine potential areas for coordination

Preservation/Green space

Stakeholder input
- Green space
- Eco-friendly bioswale
- Lack of windbreak & trees, especially around wetlands, such as Eastsound Swale
- Less fossil fuel dependency

Precepts
- Redesign edges of water retention pond at village green
- Develop standards for treatment of interventions near critical wetland areas
- Develop interpretive signs and mapping for the bioswale.
- Make Eastsound a village on a wetland park

Public Spaces

Stakeholder input
- The museum
- The library with wi-fi
- The Odd Fellows Hall, (space & organization on the whole)
- Village Green, make it less deserted, enliven year round
- Stage is good
- Village Green does not appear inviting (lacks draw) when empty
- Playground on village green
- Add character to the Green
- Terrace the Green around Band shell (i.e. 30’ tread, 18” risers)
- Village Green is too bland, shape it, enliven it

Precepts
o Make Transport hub at Fern St ROW a public square. Enliven with commercial uses facing it.

o Increase development/use of Village Green. Add shed on north perimeter with formal gate between Pizza and movies. Add shed for outdoor display on Museum side (making museum more a part of the experience). Build on architectural language of the Band shell to enhance special place.

o Connect to trail system on west side and to transport hub/town square across North Beach Road. Create Children’s playground in one corner.

o With closing of Crescent Beach Road, make Crescent Beach a multi-use waterfront park/campground.

o Obtain Victory Hill for public use such as park, public outlook, beer garden, festival support facilities (artist/musician housing, studios, school)

o Add public flagpole, fireplace, hero statue

o Regrade Village Green to make it essentially level

o Make access to library more visible

Water Orientation

Stakeholder input

- Water views
- Additional 20 mooring buoys
- Expanded dock
- Pier from Main street to Indian Island
- Get views through shops to water as well as view corridors between
- Get more boaters to come

Precepts

- Maximize public buoys in Fishing Bay.
- Create dinghy dock off Main Street
- Create a pier from Main Street to Indian Island
- Enforce Waterfront Access Plan
- Add design standards for building transparency in waterfront zone
- Extend waterfront commercial zoning along Haven Road to County Dock
- Create a marina in Fishing Bay
- Extend season for county dock
- Replicate Templin’s Pier with marina
- Take pier to Indian Island add marina
- Expand county dock
Create nice scale stair to water at outflow

Traffic

Stakeholder input

- Two-way streets
- Ease of navigation throughout town; lack of one-way streets
- No stoplights
- Hazardous mix of vehicles, pedestrians and bicycles
- Lack of public transit
- Too much traffic through town (back-up on Main St)
- Too much “car friendly” attitude
- Lack of ability to go to Lover’s Lane
- Amount of traffic on Seaview Street – lacking infrastructure for residences and mixed traffic
- Commercial truck parking times/smaller town
- Ferries to Eastsound
- Open Fern Street ROW between Prune and N Beach as street
- Close Crescent Beach Drive
- Push A Street west to Lovers Lane
- Close Main Street, Lovers Lane to N.Beach

Precepts

- Extend Rose Street both west to Lover’s Lane (through Ace Hardware) and East to Terrell Beach road. (provide better alternative through traffic route connected to but missing heart of Eastsound)
- Close Crescent Beach Road as a through road. (reduce through traffic on Main Street)
- Use Rose Street (eastbound) and Main Street (westbound) as one way couplet, permanently, seasonally or for special events only. (reduce through traffic on Main street)
- Implement transport hub as central exchange for shuttle services to /from Doe Bay, Deer Harbor, Orcas.
- Extend A Street west to Lovers Lane (ease traffic on Prune Aly & North Beach)
- Close Main Street, Lovers Lane to N.Beach
- Make Main Street one-way westbound, Lovers Lane to N. Beach
- Access Village Core from N. Beach via Enchanted Forest
- Close North Beach to all but electric cars, add charging stations
Parking

Stakeholder input

- Insufficient parking (year round)
- Not enough for employees & tenants of businesses
- Parking solutions using school, senior center and fire station
- “too large” parallel parking spaces
- Parking outside commercial core use walking trails
- Underground parking for new construction
- Better school circulation
- Cluster solutions outside core (i.e. dog park)
- Develop animated plaza over parking

Precepts

- Provide Parking “clusters” on Rose Street Extension East of Madrona Street and between Rose and A streets East of Orion, and/or at Mt Baker Road and North Beach Road, and/or on Haven Rd. (supplement on-street parking on Prune Alley/North Beach corridor with parking within easy walking distance)
- Negotiate employer agreement for use of School parking for employees during peak season.
- Create a paid parking scenario for use of church and movie theatre parking by public in off hours.
- Create density/ and or tax incentive for underground parking in core
- Allow and create design standards for above ground parking decks on periphery of core.
- Redo parking striping where it provides excessive space
- Zone the Prune Aly to North Beach strip for underground parking under all development
- Develop standards allowing parking to integrate at edges of wetlands
- Extend Orion South and add parking at edge of Wetland

Walking/sidewalks/Trails

Stakeholder input

- Essentials like groceries, post office, and schools within walking distance
- Walkability
- Basic services are all within walking distance
• Incomplete sidewalks
• Poor parking and pedestrian safety on some streets year around
• Lack of visitor awareness
• Lack of directional signage for businesses
• Become less car friendly, more pedestrian focused
• Walking mall (perhaps close off Prune Ally)
• Parking & pedestrian walk-ways outside commercial core of Eastsound
• Address assisted living within Eastsound
• Develop Fern Street ROW as pedestrian connection
• Make a walking Village
• Incorporate all Village core streets in sidewalk, light, street furniture standards
• Unify Village experience through streetscape (frees visitors to discover layers of detail)
• Make it so you can walk and get lost in romantic charm
• Increase capacity to accommodate walking (wider walks, closed streets)

Precepts
  o Reduce on-street parking on Prune Alley and North Beach in favor of continuous sidewalk/planting strips.
  o Improve, Identify, celebrate trails from airport through swale to Village Green and on to Library Park and on to Waterfront Park, and on to Crescent Beach and the woodland trail.
  o Create a walking ground plane from Prune Aly to North Beach Road, from Main Street to School Road, Tying buildings together with frequent through street connections.
  o Add a street tree standard to sidewalks to create continuous tree shaded walks
  o Develop standard for street furniture by island artisans
  o Close Main Street, Lovers Lane to North Beach
  o Develop path from Buck Park to Funhouse
  o Close Prune Aly, North Beach Main to School road to all but service and handicapped vehicles
  o Do a public streetscape campaign
  o Develop a walking Path from Village Core to Center House (behind properties on east side of North Beach Road)

Bicycles

  Stakeholder input

  • Lack of bike lanes
• Need Bicycle trails
• Need Bicycle parking
• Be more Bicycle friendly

**Precepts**
- Separate bicycles from roads. Make bikes only trail from Orcas to Eastsound on OPALCO easement. Use tax or cash incentive to expand terms of easement.
- Create Bike parking facilities in several locations in the commercial core
- Use the Fern Street ROW, in part, for Bike gathering and parking

**Eastsound Vision Task Group Participants:**

- Greg Ayers, Co-Chair
- John Campbell
- Christian Carlson
- David Ellertsen
- Peter Fisher
- Chuck Greening
- Susan Gudgel
- Joe Herrin
- James Jonassen, Task Leader

- David Kau
- Fred Klein
- Bob Maynard, Co-Chair
- Rysia Suchecka
- Ben Trogdon
- Chris Rost
- Ben Trogdon
- Gordon Walker
- John Warburton
You, as an important stakeholder in the Orcas and Eastsound community, are invited to participate in influencing the future development of Eastsound Village by reacting to the report “Vision for Eastsound” in public forums, by completing and submitting this survey and by engaging in efforts to make the things you want to happen.

This survey is a companion to that report and is part of the effort by the Eastsound Planning Review Committee to establish a vision for the core Village of Eastsound to help guide future planning that accommodates inevitable change in the most positive way for the community.

Please copy or print it out, complete it and submit it as indicated on last page, or go to https://goo.gl/forms/RhcmmatHN9MrTrym2 and submit online.

Your Ideas/dreams

The report attempts to illustrate ideas and dreams that have been articulated by stakeholders like yourself. What ideas or dreams do you have for the village that have not been included yet? Please describe:

Character and Design

The Village currently has a design review process only for projects seeking an exception/variance from architectural standards.

1. Should the village set up mandatory design review as a means of achieving design excellence?

2. Should the village attempt to create a style image for itself as discussed in the Character/Design section?
3. Should focal point architecture be encouraged to help draw people (i.e. west end of A street, north end of North Beach)?
4. Should storefront standards be developed?
5. Should street level retail be required in the village core?

**Housing in the Village Core**

The village core (quarter mile radius) currently has about 60 residences. In 20 years the Urban Growth area must accommodate about 800 new residences. The densest residential zoning is currently in the Village core (40 units/acre).

6. What is the most desirable number of residences in the village?
   - [ ] None
   - [ ] <100
   - [ ] 100-250
   - [ ] >250
   - [ ] Other (please define)

7. Should third floor housing be allowed in the village?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] Don’t care, doesn’t matter...

8. Should any building taller than three stories be allowed in the village?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] Don’t care, doesn’t matter...

9. Should single family residences be allowed in the Village Commercial (highest density) zone?
   - [ ] No
   - [ ] Yes
   - [ ] Don’t care, doesn’t matter...

10. If single family residences are allowed in the Village Commercial zone, should they be subject to the same architectural standards as other buildings in that zone?
    - [ ] No
    - [ ] Yes
    - [ ] Don’t care, doesn’t matter...
Traffic and Parking

There are now approximately 1200 parking spaces, public and private in the village core.

Requirements for retail commercial are 1 space/300nsf and for residential units 1/unit<550sf, 1.5/unit>550sf.

Main Street is a through street for traffic to and from the eastern half of the island.

11. Should all required parking be provided on the property generating the need, or should some of the demand be accommodated in walking distance but in separate parking clusters?
   □ All on property
   □ Some in clusters
   □ Don’t care, doesn’t matter

12. Are parking requirements currently too low or too high?
   □ Just right
   □ Too low
   □ Too high

13. Should on-street parking be maximized for convenience or minimized for a walkable and landscaped village?
   □ Parking maximized
   □ Parking Minimized
   □ A balance but favor parking
   □ A balance but favor walking

14. Should time limited street parking (i.e. 2 hour) be implemented?
15. Should streets be set up to favor motorized traffic flow or pedestrian flow?
   □ Favor motorized traffic
   □ Favor pedestrian traffic
   □ Don’t care, doesn’t matter

16. Should there be additional streets into and out of Eastsound?
   □ No
   □ Eastbound
   □ Westbound
Response to Precepts (Dreams Illustrated)

The following are the precepts in the Vision for Eastsound Report. Please Rank them on the following scale:

1. absolutely support
2. Good Idea
3. Indifferent idea
4. Bad idea
5. absolutely oppose

- Select/Retail Deputy County Manager for Orcas
- Aquatic Center
- Increase Public Restrooms
- Homage to April
- Increase Amenities
- Orcas Art Museum
- Tromp L’oeil Facades
- Complimentary Driving School
- Add color standards: white based along waterfront? Dark grey roofs?
- Grey, white color standard
- Add allowance for contemporary design shed roofs, low pitch 1 ½-2:12
- Encourage street facing balconies, porches
- Reconsider 35’ height limit north of Rose Street
- Enable contemporary architecture of quality
- Create a “village core” zone? (essentially exists as Village Commercial so modify?)
- Make the Prune Aly to North Beach Road corridor a special design zone
- Reward/encourage development of a few architectural icons
- Eastsound ‘Seaside Village Esthetic
  - BUILDINGS
  - STOREFRONTS
  - STREETSCAPE
- Retail / Housing Density Scenario  A
- Retail / Housing Density Scenario  B
- Retail / Housing Density Scenario  C
- Housing Only Density a)
- Housing Only Density b)
- Housing Only Density c)
- Housing Only Density d)
- An Inn on Victory Hill
- Inn & Institute on Victory Hill
- A Mini Home Park for design worthy Residence
- Identify areas for new constructed wetlands
- New Constructed wetlands/parking/development partnerships
- Restored Beach/ Public Park
- Amphitheatre Tiers
- Mini Playground
- Year Round Roofed Sheds
- Pea Patch Gardens (alt.1)
- Pea Patch Gardens (alt. 2)
- Park/Passage
- Town (or April) Square
- Transit & Non-motorized Vehicle Center
- Grand Stair & Ramp
- Public Outlook
- Outflow Stair to Beach
- Waterfront View Corridors
- 20 New Buoys
- Expanded Capacity
- Waterfront Dinghy Dock
- Historic Templin’s pier Replicated
- Pier to Indian Island
- Grand Canal
- Fern Street
- Fern Street One Way
- Rose and A Street extensions
- Western Connection
- Connecting A St. to Orion St.
- One Way
- One Way Couplets
- Re-route traffic
- Identify potential public parking areas
- A Street Parking Cluster
Madrona Street Parking Cluster
Main at Madrona Parking Cluster
Retention Pond Parking Cluster
Enchanted Forest Parking Cluster
Time Limit Street Parking
Retailers/Institutions encourage use of lesser used private parking
Parallel parking along 50’ right of way
Parking Lot Fern St ROW
North Beach for EV parking /Charging Stations
Parking at the Port
Unified streetscape in Village Core
Identify areas to enhance and encourage paths to the core
Street Furniture
Walking and Biking Trails
Buck Park/Fun House/Orcas Center/village Trail
Interpretive Center/Trails Restored Public Access
Main Street Promenade
North Beach Promenade
Prune Alley Promenade
The Walking Zone

Village Scenario

In your idealized future which 10 precepts would you choose to be realized in Eastsound village (including your own)?

1.
2.
3.
4.
5.
6.
7.
8.
9.
10.
Any additional comment that you would care to share?

Your name:

Resident of Orcas?

☐ Yes
☐ No

Your contact information (optional)

Please mail completed survey to:
Jonassen
PO Box 23
Deer Harbor, WA 98243

Or
Complete survey at https://goo.gl/forms/RhcmmatHN9MrTrym2
or
hand in at the Orcas Island Public Library

Thank you for engaging in this!