

**City of Gig Harbor Planning Commission
Work Study Session and Public Hearing
Council Chambers
December 6, 2012
5:00 pm**

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

STAFF PRESENT: Staff: Tom Dolan and Jennifer Kester

Approval of Minutes: October 4th, November 1st, November 15th

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of October 4, 2012. Pasin/Coughlin – Motion carried.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of November 1st, 2012. Pasin/Coughlin – Motion carried.

It was decided to take 5 minutes to review the minutes of November 15, 2012. Mr. Atkins asked about the 3 discussion items that are referenced as not being discussed and what they were. Ms. Kester stated that they had not discussed mechanical equipment and elevators, requiring variation in building height along the street and how height allowances affects the pedestrian experience. Mr. Gagliano suggested that it should say it was decided to finish this topic at the next meeting and everyone agreed with that language. Mr. Pasin asked that the wording on the last page be changed to state that he asked for comments about flat roof design. Mr. Gagliano said that he wanted to clarify that he had suggested elimination of the basic structure requirement only in the DB and WC zone and asked to strike “and everyone agreed”.

MOTION: Move to approve the minutes of November 15, 2012 as amended. Gagliano/Pasin – Motion carried.

Work Study Session – 5:00 p.m.

Downtown Building Height Amendments – Building Height – Consider height increase allowances for buildings in the View Basin (up to 2 stories).

Ms. Kester asked that they looked at the packet she had provided and confirm that she had accurately summarized the decisions made. Mr. Atkins went through each of the items and asked if everyone agreed with the conclusions. Discussion was held on the items and explanations given on how the conclusions were reached for those members who were not in attendance. Mr. Gagliano went over how they arrived at the 26'-28' suggestion for the height limit. It was decided to go with 26' to avoid trying to squeeze three stories into 28'. The commission decided to further discuss allowing for additional height for pitched roofs at the next meeting.

Ms. Kester noted that she had added the B-2 zone to the consideration per notes from the last meeting and the commission decided to keep it DB and WC until they heard comments from the public hearing.

Discussion was held on only allowing 2 stories along the street face and 32' on the downhill side. Mr. Pasin emphasized the importance of having the same height on both sides of the street. It was decided to continue this discussion when they could draw scenarios and visualize it more accurately at the next meeting. Ms. Kester also recommended that the measurement could be taken from the parkway in order to include other streets than Harborview. Discussion followed on what this would do to the streetscape and other possibilities for where you would measure from.

Chairman Atkins called a 5 minutes recess prior to the public hearing.

Public Hearing – 6:00 p.m.

Chairman Atkins reconvened the meeting and Ms. Kester introduced the two topics for the public hearing. Ms. Kester noted that she had received written comments from both David Boe and Debra Ross. Chairman Atkins opened the public hearing at 6:00 p.m.

Downtown Building Size Amendments – Both of the following amendments would apply to the Downtown Business (DB) zoning district and the Waterfront Commercial (WC) zoning district that abuts the DB district.

1. **Additional Interior Gross Floor Area:** For existing buildings, additional gross floor area may be added and the total gross floor area may exceed the maximum allowed by the zoning district provided that the additional gross floor area to be added is interior to the building and does not enlarge or expand the existing building footprint. Roof modifications to accommodate the increase in interior gross floor area are allowed provided the roof modifications do not exceed the maximum building height allowed in the underlying zone.
2. **Remodeling and Rebuilding Nonconforming Buildings:** Nonconforming buildings can be remodeled or torn down and rebuilt to the same or smaller configuration. Non-historic registry eligible buildings must meet the Design Manual requirements to the extent possible (materials, windows, color etc.) All work on historic registry eligible or registered nonconforming buildings must meet the requirements of GHMC 17.99.580 Preservation of historic structures, no matter the age of the building.

David Boe, Boe Architects, 705 Pacific Ave., Tacoma WA – Mr. Boe noted that the city's comprehensive plan asked for these types of incentives and was really happy to see these amendments being proposed. He stated he had worked on several projects in the harbor. He stated that the only comment he had was regarding the building height. He also noted that there are other tweaks that could be done to get a better design result on a challenging site. He said he was

addressing item #1. He said that when you are looking at a building you want to make the integrity of the building complete. He noted if the height is already nonconforming then you should not exceed the existing height of the building rather than using a site related height measurement. He emphasized the need for any building modifications to stay within the existing building height and character. He said that he felt that item #2 made sense and agreed with being able to rebuild something that is nonconforming.

Ms. Kester summarized Debra Ross's letter to the commission. She stated that her main comment was that she would like to see the amendments apply to the WM zone as well.

Mr. Atkins closed the public hearing at 6:10 p.m.

The commission discussed the comments received and Mr. Pasin noted that he did feel that more discussion was needed on whether or not to include the WM zone as Ms. Ross has suggested. Mr. Dolan proposed that both the suggestions of Ms. Ross and Mr. Boe be discussed at the next meeting. Ms. Kester stated that in reference to Mr. Boe's comments, she would like to clarify that the commission had discussed the roof accommodation and whether they should be allowed to stay within the top of the ridge line no matter the underlying height allowance. It was her recollection was that because it was difficult to determine on a broad basis how allowing roof modifications above the height limits may affect views, the issue of height limit should be discussed separately. She noted that the Planning commission has since discussed recommending adjusting the height allowance to 26' or 28'.

Other Business

Discussion of upcoming meetings – December 20th and January 3rd.

Adjournment

Move to adjourn at 6:25 p.m. Gagliano/Baldwin – Motion carried.