

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission and Design Review Board
Minutes of Joint Work-Study Session
Thursday, February 10, 2005
Gig Harbor Civic Center**

PRESENT: Commissioners Bruce Gair, Dick Allen, Scott Wagner, Theresa Malich and Chairperson Carol Johnson. Commissioner Kathy Franklin was absent. Board members Linda Gair, Paul Kadzik, Jim Pasin, Dawn Stanton and Chairperson Chuck Hunter
Staff present: Steve Osguthorpe and Diane Gagnon.

CALL TO ORDER: 6:10 p.m.

NEW BUSINESS

1. City of Gig Harbor, 3510 Grandview Street, Gig Harbor WA – Proposed text amendments creating waterfront view corridors and limiting building sizes in the height restriction area.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe gave his staff report explaining that the City Council had initiated this proposed text amendment and that these changes would pertain to the height restriction area (view basin) only. He further stated that the time frame specified would adopt the text amendments by April 11, 2005 which was one day prior to the expiration of the moratorium. Mr. Osguthorpe then stated that the proposed changes added a new section establishing a waterfront view corridor and in conjunction with these view corridors, development standards are proposed that would impose a limited footprint size, floor area ratio maximum, progressive side yard setback requirement, 20-foot separation, limitation on fence heights and hedges, and a limitation on vegetation types in side yards. Additionally Mr. Osguthorpe stated that the Council's proposal would impose a 6500 square-foot limit in the DB district and also in the B-2 and C-1 districts abutting Harborview and North Harborview Drives within the height restriction area. Mr. Osguthorpe went on to explain that the City Council did not intend this as a substitute for the building size charette but rather to address some immediate concerns expressed by the public.

The group first discussed the progressive side yard setback requirement and Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe drew an example on the whiteboard of how the requirement would work. Board member Dawn Stanton asked what the average length of lots along the waterfront was and Mr. Osguthorpe replied that it varies and that since some of the lots extend into the water, knowing the average length wouldn't achieve anything.

Commissioner Dick Allen handed out an example he had drawn of how this regulation would work on a typical lot.

They then discussed the footprint size limitation. Mr. Osguthorpe explained what the Basic Structure Unit was and board member Jim Pasin asked for further clarification of the floor area ratio as it applied to the 2000 square foot footprint limitation.

Mr. Osguthorpe explained that the floor area ratio (FAR) was the total floor area of all structures on a single lot in proportion to the total lot area lying upland of the ordinary high water mark. Discussion followed on the floor area ratio and how it would work in different situations.

Board member Pasin asked if we want businesses along the waterfront does this allow that. Mr. Osguthorpe stated that there are similar regulations in place currently. Commissioner Wagner asked if the current restaurants were within these square footage limitations

Board member Chuck Hunter expressed that he felt this was grossly unfair to people with waterfront property and that a pure building size limitation would be better. Planning Manager Osguthorpe reiterated that this would not preclude there from being a pure building size limitation as a result of the upcoming charette process.

Commissioner Wagner stated that he wanted to make sure that the building size limitations would still allow all the uses allowed in a particular zone.

Commissioner Malich asked about the shoreline regulations and whether or not you could build right up to the bulkhead and Mr. Osguthorpe replied that in Gig Harbor you can build right up to the bulkhead.

Commissioner Gair pointed out that some of these regulations made a lot of properties along North Harborview non-conforming.

Planning Manager Osguthorpe asked the group whether or not they felt there was a need to limit size in the view basin and the consensus was yes, there is a need to limit size.

Chuck Hunter, Chairman of the Design Review Board then displayed a graphic overlay of the historic district, the zoning and the height restriction area that he and Dawn had created. He stated that he felt that the Council's proposal was going in a different direction than the building size limitations. Dawn Stanton then gave a short presentation on their idea for a 3500 square foot footprint limitation. She stated that her idea included a grandfathering clause which would allow a business to remain in perpetuity. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe clarified that grandfathering does not allow a structure to be rebuilt to an existing non-conforming status, but rather it may remain until such time as it has been destroyed to beyond 50% of its value.

Board member Chuck Hunter expressed his lack of support for the proposal put forth by the City Council as he felt it went in a different direction than the building size limitations and only addressed the waterfront. Additionally, he stated that he felt that backing out of these regulations after the charette process would be difficult.

Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe stated that if it was the desire of the group they could recommend denial of the proposal and continue with the charette. He further explained the charette process and reiterated that this proposal was not a replacement for the charette.

Commissioner Wagner stated that he felt a more global look at the area was necessary and Mr. Osguthorpe reminded the group that a proposal that went beyond the scope of the current proposal would require an additional 60-day review period from the state. He then went over the proposal as it was sent to the state and what changes would trigger starting the review process over.

It was then decided to go through each item in the draft text amendments individually.

First, was section 1.7.02 Waterfront View Corridor Standards, Number 1 Setbacks. Board member Linda Gair pointed out that the public had asked for a view corridor and suggested maintaining the spacing between buildings.

Commissioner Wagner stated that in some areas it works well to have buildings clustered together.

Commissioner Allen pointed out that there are several areas along the waterfront to view the water. Additionally he stated that this will continue as the Shoreline Master Program requires viewing opportunities and that he felt that providing a view between each building seems like an undue hardship. He then illustrated all the publicly owned land that is located along the water for view opportunities. He then read a memo from City Attorney Carol Morris stating that private views cannot be legislated and that the only legal way to protect views is through publicly owned properties and he felt the city was doing a good job of that.

Board member Chuck Hunter stated that views cannot be created that can be seen by car, you need to be either walking or biking.

Commissioner Wagner stated that he felt the graduated setback proposal did not work. Planning Manager Osguthorpe asked if overall the group was supportive of the need for view corridors and that this was an area which required different regulations. The group consensus was yes.

The next item for discussion was fencing and hedges. Planning Manager Steve Osguthorpe asked if the group fundamentally believed that fencing and hedges should be regulated and the group agreed that yes they should be regulated except for security fences.

Dawn Stanton stated that she didn't understand why they couldn't address the whole downtown and Mr. Osguthorpe explained the Council's request and that this was the proposal before the group tonight.

It was then decided to move on to the next item, Landscaping in Side Yards. Mr. Osguthorpe asked if the group felt that there should be limitations on trees and shrubs and the consensus was yes.

Commissioner Gair pointed out that the Planning Commission had discussed these issues back in 2002 and passed out a copy of the 2002 recommendations.

Board member Chuck Hunter stated that he didn't understand why the Council wanted to mess around with the view corridor and that they should just address the building size.

Chairman Carol Johnson reminded the group that they could say they agree with protecting the view corridor but don't agree with this proposal. Commissioner Wagner suggested that a list of recommendations be forwarded along with that.

Board member Pasin suggested that they move to the last page and address the changes to the individual zones. There followed a discussion of the existing building sizes in the downtown.

Dawn Stanton pointed out that 4200 square feet allows larger than the Luengen building. Board member Jim Pasin stated that he felt 6500 was too small.

Commissioner Wagner suggested looking at what uses are allowed in each zone and determining what building size works.

Commissioner Gair stated that all of this had been previously discussed in 2002.

Mr. Pasin then asked the group if the 6500 square foot limitation was acceptable. Ms. Stanton proposed 6000 square feet. Commissioner Wagner then suggested that internal circulation be allowed. Linda Gair stated that in Whistler BC the buildings are together yet designed in such a way as to look separate.

Planning Manager Osguthorpe asked the group if they agreed to the 6000 square foot limitation in the DB zone and the consensus was yes, to allow internal doorways no larger than 6' wide through fire walls between structures and to require external doors.

The next item was the B-2 zone and the consensus was to limit the square footage to 6000 and not require the separation. Discussion followed on the need for different regulations for different B-2 areas and it was decided to require a 20' separation in the beach basket area of the B-2 zone.

The next item was the C-1 zone. Discussion followed on the Historical Society's purchase of the Beach Basket site and the possible impacts of these regulations on their proposal. It was decided to limit the square footage to 6000 and require 20' separation between buildings.

Paul Kadzik clarified that the group did not seem to be in support of the graduated setbacks and that they still needed to talk about the floor area ratios and footprints at the next meeting.

Chairman Johnson asked that if there was anyone who could not attend the next meeting to please submit ideas and comments in writing prior to the meeting.

NEXT REGULAR MEETING:

February 17, 2005 at 6pm – Work-Study Session

ADJOURN:

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 9:00 p.m.
Gair/Wagner – unanimously approved

CD recorder utilized:
Disc #1 Track 1
Disc #2 Track 1