

**GIG HARBOR CITY COUNCIL
DESIGN REVIEW MANUAL WORKSESSION**

September 20, 2004, 6:00 p.m. – Civic Center Community Rooms

PRESENT:

Councilmembers: Steve Ekberg, Paul Conan, Jim Franich, Bob Dick, and John Picinich. Mayor Wilbert presided over the meeting.

Staff: Mark Hoppen, John Vodopich, Steve Osguthorpe, Carol Morris, and Diane Gagnon

Mayor Wilbert opened the work-study session at 6:03. Steve Osguthorpe, Planning Manager gave a brief overview of what had been accomplished at the previous worksession and noted that we would be continuing with section 1.4 of the Design Manual tonight.

1.3 Enhancement Corridor – Revised screening requirements

Mr. Osguthorpe went over the new language that the Council had asked him to provide for the Enhancement Corridor section. He noted that he had provided three different options for the screening requirement and asked the City Council for their direction on which option they would prefer. He also noted that the existing language seemed to only apply to that portion of parcels directly abutting the SR-16 corridor and he was proposing new language which included all development within the Enhancement Corridor which he believed was the council's intent. He distributed the Visually Sensitive Areas map which illustrates the Enhancement Corridor and the Visual Interchange Nodes. Discussion was held on the different nodes and the reasons for each. It was further clarified that the Visually Sensitive Areas map is in the Comprehensive Plan and is proposed to be included the Design Manual.

Mr. Osguthorpe explained the three different options for screening within the Enhancement Corridor. Option 1 was to require full screening along all property lines abutting SR-16, except those in defined visual interchange nodes, Option 2 was to require full screening as in option #1, except state that up to 30% visibility may be achieved if it does not expose any development, including development on abutting properties, that does not conform to all design standards and Option 3 was to eliminate the requirement to screen development on abutting parcels. He stated that staff was recommending Option 3. Mr. Osguthorpe answered questions from Councilmembers and the public. Councilmembers were undecided between Options 1 and 3 and asked that staff include language for both options to be voted on at a later date.

1.4 Zone Transition

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe described where the zone transition standards apply and explained the zone transition categories. Mr. Osguthorpe

pointed out that the option for vegetative buffering in the view basin had been eliminated in the draft update to the Design Manual. He stated that this section had been discussed more than any other section of the Design Manual and the Planning Commission had appointed a sub-committee including members of both the Design Review Board and Planning Commission to address these issues. In response to questions about height and setbacks in the zone transition standards, he explained that the Design Review Board does not rule on setbacks or height allowances. However, under the alternative zone transition standards, the DRB could make recommendations on heights and setbacks more restrictive than the underlying zone for mitigation purposes.

Discussion was held on the Design Review process and Mr. Osguthorpe clarified that the public is notified at the Design Review Board stage and at the Hearing Examiner stage. Councilmembers then asked about the Zone Transition standards and the requirements to reflect the size of neighboring properties and what impact this has when the existing buildings are non-conforming. Mr. Osguthorpe also explained that the language had been changed from limiting the building footprint size to the average of the neighboring buildings to those within 200'. Councilmembers expressed concern with perpetuating existing non-conformities and therefore never meeting our goals. Further discussion was held on if something was zoned R-3 you should be able to build something feasible for that zone and it was pointed out that the Design Review Board does have the flexibility to recommend approval on a site specific basis.

Michael Katterman pointed out that the language in 1.4.03 conflicts with the 200' standard and makes the whole site apply. Planning Manager Osguthorpe replied that he would develop language to address this item.

Councilmember Ekberg asked if a map could be developed showing where these transitions occur. Mr. Osguthorpe replied that a map could be developed, but that there was a lot of overlap in the various zone transition categories that may complicate such a map.

The City Attorney Carol Morris asked that the City Council articulate the public interest in buffering B-2 from C-1 and explained that it must be based on a legitimate public purpose rather than a committees desire to have a buffer.

Discussion was held on the pending Building Size Analysis and the discussions being held on the possible need for downtown zones which address the special needs of the downtown core.

Carl Halsan of Halsan Frey Associates pointed out that the footnote at the bottom of page 19 does not mention the alternatives for zone transition and Mr. Osguthorpe responded that he would clarify the language.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that he felt he had heard everyone's concerns and would come back to the next meeting with some suggested language.

Ray Frey from Halsan Frey Associates suggested language for page 10 of the Industrial Building Exemption to state "roads serving as primary access would not be considered outside the ED" to prevent the situation where a property's main access were within the Enhancement Corridor and the ED zone they would not have to be completely screened. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that he would examine that section.

Councilmembers decided to set further meeting dates at the next Council Meeting.

There were no further comments and the worksession ended at 8:00 p.m.

Respectfully submitted:


Diane Gagnon, Planning & Building Assistant