

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session
Planning Conference Room
April 4, 2013
5:00 pm**

PRESENT: Rick Gagliano, Jim Pasin, Pam Peterson, Craig Baldwin, Bill Coughlin, Reid Ekberg and Harris Atkins.

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Lita Dawn Stanton, Lindsey Sehmel and Peter Katich

Approval of Minutes

Mr. Coughlin pointed out that he was absent at the February 21st meeting and couldn't have made the motion to adjourn. Ms. Sehmel said she would correct them.

MOTION: Move to adopt the minutes of February 21st with the change of Mr. Ekberg making the motion to adjourn. Pasin/Coughlin, motion passed.

MOTION: Move to adopt the March 7th. Baldwin/Gagliano. Motion passed

MOTION: Move to adopt the March 21st as written. Pasin/Coughlin. Motion passed

WORK-STUDY SESSION

1. Downtown Building Size Amendments –

Deliberation on Downtown Heights for the downtown commercial zones, based upon comments received at public hearing held March 21, 2013.

Mr. Atkins noted that there were two issues to go over; the first being where this would apply and second was how to measure the height. He asked that they take a poll on which zones they felt this should apply. Ms. Peterson said that she felt that it should apply to areas as proposed. Mr. Gagliano felt that it should just be the DB zone along Harborview on the uphill side, perhaps up Pioneer to the church. Mr. Ekberg said he agreed with all of DB and WC as it abuts DB. Mr. Baldwin agreed with the DB and WC as it abuts. Mr. Coughlin said he agreed with the DB but had a little concern with the WC. Mr. Pasin said he supports all the DB and WC abutting DB. He additionally said that he felt that perhaps 27' was a foot or two too short. Mr. Ekberg said he had also had that thought. Mr. Atkins said he wanted to include the entire DB, he wasn't sure that it should include WC. Ms. Sehmel pointed out the area that would allow development agreements that may allow additional height. Mr. Gagliano went over his reasons for not including the WC. Through a show of hands, 6 members agreed that the entire DB should be included and 4 members agreed to include the WC abutting DB. Discussion was held on whether 27' was the right number. Through a show of hands it was decided to recommend 27' height. Discussion was then held on how the

27' should be measured. Ms. Sehmel went over how the height is currently measured and noted that they had previously discussed whether it should be the footprint, the property line or the right of way adjacent to the parcel. Mr. Ekberg said he still felt that it should be the footprint. Mr. Pasin said he thought it should be measured at the sidewalk. Discussion was held on perhaps expanding the Parkway designation to include the parcels Southeast of Soundview. Mr. Atkins pointed out that this really only affected three properties. Discussion continued on how to measure the 27' height and whether it should be existing or final grade. It was decided to recommend that the 27' be measured from the footprint of the front facing facade.

Mr. Atkins called a 5 minute recess.

Senior Planner Lindsey Sehmel went over several scenarios for measuring from existing and/or final grade. Mr. Baldwin said he had always thought they were staying within a 27' envelope and that he was more inclined to go with existing grade. Discussion was held on the Design Manual requirements to respect natural topography. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that if you go with final grade you will get people doing strange things to the natural topography. Mr. Ekberg said that he felt it should be measured from existing and it seems to be consistent with other regulations. Ms. Peterson said she thought it should be existing. Mr. Coughlin agreed. Mr. Pasin said he could accept existing with some reservations. It was decided to measure from existing grade. Mr. Gagliano pointed out that they still needed to discuss the building envelope and whether they can exceed 27' within the building envelope as long as they stay at 27' at the street and on the downhill. Discussion was held on possible scenarios with averaging. It was decided to recommend the restriction of 27' at the front and rear and an average in the middle. Mr. Katich also noted that they would need to add language saying that in no case can the building exceed the maximum allowed uphill elevation. Ms. Sehmel said she would draft language for the next meeting for them to review.

OTHER BUSINESS

Discussion of upcoming meetings – April 11th, 2013

ADJOURNMENT

MOTION: Move to adjourn at 7:12 pm. Pasin/Ekberg – Motion carried.