

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission  
Work Study Session and Public Hearing  
Planning Conference Room  
October 4, 2012  
5:00 pm**

**PRESENT:** Rick Gagliano, Reid Ekberg, Jim Pasin, Craig Baldwin and Bill Coughlin. Harris Atkins and Michael Fisher were absent.

**STAFF PRESENT:** Staff: Tom Dolan and Jennifer Kester

**CALL TO ORDER:** at 5:00 p.m.

**APPROVAL OF MINUTES:** August 16<sup>th</sup>, September 20<sup>th</sup>

Ms. Kester suggested that the last sentence prior to adjournment be struck since Mr. Gagliano had not provided the map.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of August 16<sup>th</sup> as amended.  
Coughlin/Gagliano – Motion carried.

The minutes of September 20<sup>th</sup> were deferred until the next meeting in order to allow more time for everyone to read them.

**WORK STUDY SESSION:**

**Downtown Zoning Code Amendments** – Planning Commission review and identification of codes that inhibit the preservation of character-defining historic buildings in the downtown. Discussion of potential amendments to:

1. Allow increased floor area within an existing building's envelope (mezzanines, etc).

Senior Planner Jennifer Kester went over where they were on each of the topics. Mr. Gagliano stated that he felt that in regard to uses and parking for the increased floor area amendment, everyone was in agreement. Ms. Kester agreed and went over the timing of adoption of the amendments. Mr. Dolan went over the areas being looked at by the Visioning Committee. Discussion followed on how these amendments need to mesh with the visioning project and the shoreline master program. Everyone agreed that all downtown business zones and the waterfront commercial zones should be included.

Discussion followed on building height in relation to this amendment and went over Ms. Kester's proposed language. How design review would apply to the review of each project was discussed. Ms. Kester explained that each requirement could be written to require Design Review Board approval. Mr.

Gagliano cautioned that sometimes the applicant can feel burdened by having to go through the DRB. Ms. Kester wondered if the height portion should only apply to DB. Mr. Pasin stated that he wanted to be careful to not make any of these amendments so burdensome that no one utilizes them. Mr. Baldwin agreed. Discussion followed on the impact to views. Mr. Pasin asked if there was consensus on the pitched roof proposal. Ms. Kester pointed out that any allowance of additional height would have to go to the Hearing Examiner. Mr. Dolan suggested that they allow the additional height only if it is within the permitted height of the zone. Mr. Pasin asked what they were accomplishing then and Ms. Kester said that they are still allowing additional floor area. Mr. Dolan noted that there is another common sense amendment that deals with height and that is more of an appropriate place to examine this issue further. Consensus was reached on all of the talking points with the note that the additional height increase be discussed at a later point when they have gotten further into discussion on the other items.

2. Increase the cost of remodel threshold for nonconforming buildings (currently 50% of replacement value).

Ms. Kester noted that at the last meeting the discussion had been that it shouldn't be about cost. Discussion was held on how the nonconforming uses within a nonconforming structures needs to be addressed as well. Everyone agreed that the uses should be allowed to stay and that any nonconforming structures should be allowed to be rebuilt within their existing building envelope with no threshold. Discussion followed on the allowance of combining lots with nonconforming buildings and Mr. Dolan suggested that staff go ahead and draft some language. He cautioned that there was a big difference between two buildings that have different architecture with zero lot lines and one big building. Mr. Pasin agreed and said that he was only considering the buildings looking like two separate buildings. Mr. Baldwin said that he agreed that it was not about combining buildings. Mr. Coughlin clarified that we are striking the building combination and lot combination discussion points and everyone agreed. Historic eligibility was discussed next. Mr. Gagliano explained how the historic registry and CLG process worked. Mr. Dolan stated that he wanted Dawn Stanton to come to their next meeting to talk about how they could possibly add a layer in this proposal to consider how to handle the remodel of nonconforming historic buildings.

## **OTHER BUSINESS**

Discussion of upcoming meetings – October 18, 2012 – Downtown Vision Town Hall Meeting

## **ADJOURNMENT**

MOTION: Move to adjourn Baldwin/Gagliano – Motion carried.